

The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 2, 1880.

The Week.

THERE is nothing particularly new to be said about the Presidential canvass, except that on the Republican side it drifts every day more and more rapidly into denunciation of the South, and predictions of the dreadful things the South will do in case the Democrats come into power. Most of these predictions were used freely in 1872 and 1876, and are very familiar. The only new addition to the old list we have remarked is that the South will divide Texas into five States, and with their aid rule the North with a rod of iron. Few if any outrages have as yet made their appearance, but they will probably be produced during the coming month. There are some signs of them, however, already. A private letter from "a correspondent" says that in Jackson Parish, Louisiana, "the white people whip the colored people just as they did in the days of slavery." It has been brought out, too, that there are seventy-three ex-Confederate officers in Congress—to which, however, the *Times* says there would be no objection if they would "accept the results of the war, throw their influence on the side of reason and justice," etc.—or, in other words, if they voted with the Republicans. It is a great pity that the South does not send up a solid Republican delegation; but as all its men of any value were in the rebel army, it would have to waive representation if it sent no ex-Confederates. It ought perhaps to do this, too, and confide its interests to Messrs. Blaine and Logan; but then human nature is so queer, even at the South.

"A Republican of South Carolina," who requests that his name may not be mentioned, has written a long letter to the National Committee, informing them that "the war is not ended," and expressing his "firm belief" that unless the Republicans win an overwhelming victory in November "the result will be settled by bloodshed," and that "the South is in a better condition for a fight than ever before." We may be sure this gentleman will be heard from again before November, and that the future will look darker and darker to him as the weeks roll on; but we have no doubt that he is privately perfectly calm and cheerful, and is counting on a good business year in 1881, no matter which party wins. The amount of public alarm and woe which one sees nowadays in combination with private confidence and jollity, is very diverting.

On the Democratic side there is a curious lack of activity, though there may be a change during the coming month. Butler's speech in Boston probably marks the real opening of their canvass, which will apparently consist principally of an "arraignment" of the Republicans for great but undescribed corruption. The existence of this corruption—the details of which have not hitherto been given—is deduced *à priori* from the length of time the party has been in power. The Democrats are evidently bothered a good deal by the prevailing material prosperity, and their references to it are very pious, and show more recognition of the beneficence of Providence than they have generally received credit for. They take, evidently, a good deal of comfort in the *Crédit Mobilier* and *De Golyer* transactions. They suffer greatly, however, from the want of good material for harrowing prophecy, which is the great stand-by of the Republicans, and is far more effective than any exposure of past transgressions can be. In using an opponent's "record" against him you are tied down by the facts, which are mostly very familiar to the audience, and have therefore lost much of their horror; while in predicting what he will do in the future you can draw on your imagination with perfect freedom. Democratic prophecy has, however, thus far been very tame, and frightens very few people, while the Republicans are able to predict bloody fighting and the most frightful load of taxation ever inflicted on any community. If it be made plain that to vote for Hancock is to agree to pay the rebel debt—State and Confederate—rebel claims for war damages, and full compensation for the emanci-

pated slaves, to pension all the rebel officers and soldiers, and besides this make all Southern rivers navigable, no sane man will, of course, think of voting for that officer. The Republicans, also, are "assessing" the officeholders, with the utmost rigor and resolution, for campaign expenses, which excites the mingled horror and envy of the Democrats. They hate to see such things done to secure the retention of power by so corrupt a party, and wish they could get more money themselves—somehow.

General Butler delivered his recantation speech at Faneuil Hall, in Boston, on Saturday night, to an immense and enthusiastic meeting, and is now back in his old party. He showed the tendency of long possession of power to breed corruption, and called for "change" and reform; compared the Republican and Democratic candidates and platforms, to the great advantage of the latter; expressed his deep disappointment with Mr. Hayes, and twitted him, not without force, on his admission that he acted on the Southern question, when he took office, under the advice of Dr. Woolsey, maintaining that this showed that it was Dr. Woolsey who ought to have been made President; vindicated Oakes Ames, and castigated General Garfield; ascribed the present prosperity of the country to bountiful crops and the labor of the murdered negro in raising six million bales of cotton, and castigated the Republican party; pronounced the execution of Mrs. Surratt a judicial murder, and eulogized General Hancock; pronounced himself "a friend of the negro," and gave his love for him and anxiety about him as his chief reason for leaving the Republican party. Whether he will be of any use to the Democrats it is as yet hard to say. The only certain conclusion which can be drawn from his conversion is, that he thinks the Democrats are going to win this time. We ought to add, that while he concedes that the greenbacks ought, perhaps, to be redeemable in gold and silver, he would not keep any coin in the Treasury for that purpose, but thinks "the bullion might quite as well remain in the mines, where it would give less trouble and be a great deal more safe." He is a more amusing and interesting old fellow, and we have no doubt will prove far more useful to his country, than when he was posturing as a Republican strategist and philanthropist.

It already seems clear that one of the most substantial grounds for hoping to carry New York for General Garfield, namely, the discord among the Democrats, will have to be abandoned, as the different factions are evidently "getting together," as they say. The regular State Committee has issued a call for a State Convention to nominate a candidate for Associate Justice of the Court of Appeals, after long deliberation, and upon the assurance that the Kelly party would rescind theirs, issued some time ago. The latter agreed to do this, on the understanding that they should receive as substantial recognition in the regular convention as the Anti-Tammany men got in 1876, when they in turn, though irregular, were well treated for harmony's sake. Moreover, a conference has been reached upon the subject of Assembly and Congressional nominations, and if it results favorably there will be less chance for Republican legislative and congressional candidates than there usually is. So far, Tammany appears to have got all it asked, though no more than it had reason to expect, as such things go, after its show of "strength" last fall. However, it affords the Republican papers a good deal of comfort to point out the fact that the so-called respectable wing of the party has had to come to the terms of the likes of John Kelly. This is as it should be. The better class of New York Democrats have never been able to dispense with the aid of the Canal Ring on one side and Tammany on the other, and they ought to be constantly reminded of it. Of course if they had any moral principle they would refuse to fraternize with the baser sort, and let the Republicans have all the State and local offices as well as the State's electoral vote.

Among the speakers who have taken the stump for General Garfield in Ohio is ex-Governor J. D. Cox, who evidently regards the victory

over Grantism at Chicago as a substantial one. In a speech delivered last week at Hamilton, and one of the most rational and serious of the canvasses, he addressed himself directly to independent voters, and especially such as were to be found in the Democratic ranks. His argument was directed to showing that the continued existence of the Democratic party is the greatest obstacle to reform and a re-division of public opinion on economic questions of the most pressing character, and that that party "must be dissolved." Mr. Cox even seemed to think this would be the necessary consequence of its defeat in November—a view which is probably derived from considerations of the effect the event would have on Southern hopefulness. On the other hand, he foresaw as a corollary of Republican success a still further improvement in the administration of the Government, so well begun by Mr. Hayes, whereas the Democratic incoming "would be a certainty of utter demoralization." He was prepared to say—in cruel disregard of Mr. English's feelings—that he hoped to be spared the sight of another "rotation in office" "until a President of the United States can be elected upon a distinct pledge to an explicit, well-defined, and radical system of reform in the civil service." As to General Hancock's attitude in this matter and toward reform in general, Mr. Cox said: "The plain question is, Would he cheat the party which nominated him, or would he conduct the administration in accordance with its spirit and character?" Some warm praise of General Garfield, based on long and intimate acquaintance, had all the more significance because the speaker and the candidate had taken opposite sides on "the Ohio idea."

Mr. Sherman has delivered the strongest speech of the campaign since Mr. Schurz's, in Cincinnati. It was in the main what is called "an arraignment" of the Democratic party, but made with more than usual skill and effectiveness. A man in the gallery tried to "corner" him by asking how he came to recommend people to vote for a candidate whom he had himself dismissed from office for cause, offering to vote the Republican ticket if the answer was satisfactory. The answer was that Arthur was not dismissed for anything affecting his personal character, and that, anyhow, he was better than English; but we do not believe it was satisfactory to the propounder of the question, and we fear he will vote for Hancock. Mr. Sherman does not shine when "cornered." He was very strong in his presentation of the claims of the Republican party on popular confidence and gratitude, particularly as regards the management of the finances. Indeed, we doubt if this portion of the party history has ever been so well arranged and skilfully presented. The prophetic part of the speech regarding the probable conduct of the Democrats if they got into power was an awful picture.

Wade Hampton has written a letter to the *Virginian*, explaining the much-quoted passage in his speech very much as we presumed it might be explained. He says:

"Your reporter misconceived my language. I appealed to the Virginians present to consider before they voted how Lee and Jackson would vote were they alive, and I asked if any one present could for a moment suppose that those devoted Virginians could have done anything which would create dissensions in the State they loved so well. My sole object at Staunton was to appeal to the Democrats of Virginia to forget their local differences and to unite for the success of the Democratic party. The principle involved in the war was the claim made by the South of the right of peaceable secession. This right was denied by the North, Democrats as well as Republicans joining in the denial. On this issue battle was joined. The North triumphed, and the results of her success were embodied in the amendments to the Constitution, settling beyond all question and for ever the right of peaceable secession by the adverse decision of the highest earthly tribunal recognized among mankind."

Of course this explanation wholly destroys the effect of his speech as reported, even if reported truly, and shows that he either does not hold the doctrines imputed to him or does not think them effective doctrines to preach. In private life, and in ordinary times, such a disavowal would be sufficient; but these are not ordinary times, and we cannot give up the passage in his speech as first reported; we must have it for use in this canvass. We shall be glad to hear anything he has to say by way of explanation after the first Tuesday in November, but until then we have to hold that, in a thoughtless moment at Staunton, he

revealed his intention and that of his friends to start a "new rebellion" if Hancock is elected, and imitate Lee and Jackson by fighting desperately for secession.

We believe that none of the newspapers which have been so powerfully agitated over the subject of the Southern census have undertaken to estimate the extent and inherent difficulties of the alleged conspiracy between supervisors and enumerators, to say nothing of the checks of the Census Bureau itself. Nor have they, in default of information, been able to state the ascertained proportions of whites and blacks in the suspected States. That these proportions have not changed in favor of the whites may be judged from the anxiety which the whites continue to manifest about maintaining their artificial supremacy at elections. But proof that the negro population was not only not dying out but was rapidly on the increase, would bring a double mortification to the Stalwarts—first, as exposing their exaggeration of the outrages inflicted on the freedmen, and next as accounting for the unexpected census returns. It would have been shrewder to have explained the figures by the well-known fecundity of the blacks, and thus furnished a basis for fresh calculations of the "natural" Republican vote at the South, and for deeper and louder indignation at the suppression of it by intimidation and violence.

One of the first duties of the Civil-Service Reform Publication Society, when organized, will be to send tracts and missionaries into the New Hampshire field. We say missionaries, because we consider public addresses as indispensable as documents; and we mention New Hampshire, because the Republican organ at Concord, the *Independent Statesman*, has just been giving an answer (which to the editor "seems plain") to the question which now agitates the party in that State: "What shall be the practice in making nominations for Governor, Councillors, Senators, and Representatives, and county and other local offices? Shall we nominate new men, or renominate the candidates who were voted for and elected or defeated in 1878?" In New Hampshire the elections are for two years under the new constitution, and the *Statesman* holds that the "full honors of the party" consist in one nomination and candidacy; rotation should be the practice, "with no right of complaint for failure of renominations, which should be treated as exceptions to the general rule." Special considerations of fitness may justify an indefinite number of renominations; of this the local constituency must judge. And now for the reason of the general rule. "There is no mystery about our ordinary State offices, nor peculiar skill required in administering any of them. Average citizens can hold them for one term, and give place to others who will administer as well as they. By rotation in office is government by the people preserved [italics ours]; the reverse system is unrepugnant and dangerous to liberty." However, the *Statesman* again excepts Senators and Representatives in Congress. "These we should change or retain on about the system of the other States, so as not to be at a disadvantage with them [italics ours again]. But our State officers do not compete or contend with those of other commonwealths"; hence it is of no consequence what course other States pursue with regard to theirs.

Foreign gold is now flowing freely to this country, the arrivals during the week having somewhat exceeded in value five millions of dollars. The Government officials at Washington have published an estimate that the receipts of foreign gold will average four million dollars each week until November 1 next. If anything like this amount arrives, all apprehension respecting the autumn money market may be dismissed. Although the rates for loans continue low, and loanable funds are still abundant, the surplus reserve of the New York banks continues to fall, and for the last week was as low as about \$6,650,000. The public credit, as expressed in 4 per cent. bonds, is still advancing. These bonds sold at 110½ to 110¼, or at a price which would make a ready market at par for a 3½ per cent. bond of equal length of time to run. Railroad investments still rule very high, and no class of property at present is yielding better returns than are the leading railroads. The new trunk-line, by way of the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad, to the West, which was reported last week, appears to be a legitimate business undertaking, although at the Stock Exchange many still regard it as merely an

adjunct of a huge stock speculation. The articles of incorporation for building a double-track road from Binghamton to Buffalo, which would form the missing link, have been filed, and the proper cash deposits made. General trade continues very active all over the country. The market for silver has been very steady here and in London.

The House of Lords has done a more foolish thing than rejecting the Irish Disturbance Bill by striking out from the Employers' Liability Bill the section which not only gave it all its value, but furnished the reason for framing it—namely, that which made employers liable to workmen for injuries received through the acts or omissions of fellow-workmen in the same service. The state of the law at present, which exempts employers from the responsibility towards their own workmen which attaches to them towards all the rest of the community, has long been a standing grievance of the trades-unions, which the Liberals had pledged themselves to remedy. The section stricken out by the Lords made the employer liable for injury sustained by one of his workmen through the negligence of a superintendent or foreman, or the negligence of any person in the employer's service whom the injured workman was bound to obey and did obey, or through the acts or omissions of any person done or made in compliance with the employer's rules, or in obedience to particular instructions. The rest of the act is of very little consequence, and yet Lord Beaconsfield moved and carried an amendment limiting its operation to two years. Of course, the incident will give considerable and bitter stimulus to the agitation for some change in the character of the Upper House. The peers appear to have lost heart a little when the bill empowering farmers to kill "ground game" (*i.e.*, hares and rabbits) came up, for that, under Lord Beaconsfield's advice, they passed to a second reading.

The Powers having refused to accept the excuses of Turkey for not delivering Dulcigno to the Montenegrins, and having directed the delivery within three weeks, and the three weeks on a subsequent additional delay having come to an end, "the naval demonstration" is to take place, and the ships which are to comprise it are on their way to the coast of Dalmatia. Turkey is not to be asked, as was at first supposed, to take part in it, but is to be asked to furnish any land force that may be necessary to carry out the decision of the Conference. The Powers have also answered the Porte's remonstrances against the decision concerning the Greek boundary, and have refused to recede from it in any way. There continues to be the same swarm of contradictory rumors as to what they will do in case Turkey holds out on the Greek question; but there is something approaching to an agreement that England and Russia are ready to go any needful length, that France is opposed to going any length at all, and that Germany and Austria have not made up their minds how far they will go. There seems, too, to be a very strong expectation that, in case of a refusal of the Powers to act, Greece will act alone, and that her appearance in the field will be the signal for a rising against the Turks in Bulgaria and Eastern Rumelia.

The loss of wine by the French is one of the most striking economical facts of the day. M. Leroy-Beaulieu tells the story in the last number of the *Économiste Français*, from which it appears that the production in 1869 reached 70,000,000 of hectolitres (the hectolitre is one hundred litres, and the litre is somewhat more than our quart). In 1875, although the ravages of the phylloxera—an insect which attacks the roots of the vine—had already begun, it rose to 84,000,000. It then began to fall steadily, and last year only amounted to 30,000,000. This year, it is expected, it will be smaller still. In 1872 France exported wine of the value of \$33,000,000. The amount has since been declining, and this last year only reached \$24,000,000; and that it has not gone lower is due to the rise in price of the finer wines. This, however, is not so extraordinary as the rise in the value of the wine imported. Instead of giving up drinking wine when the home supply falls short, the French consumer insists on having it. Accordingly, the imports of wine, which in 1872 were only worth \$1,600,000, reached last year the enormous figure of \$34,000,000. The imported wines now come from Italy, Spain, Algeria, Hungary, and the United States. All attempts to extirpate the phylloxera have thus far failed. The French Academy of Sciences offered a prize of \$60,000 for a preventive, with-

out success. Half the vines, it is estimated, have been already destroyed, and the best judges consider the fate of the remainder as sealed, and the total disappearance of the old French vine as only an affair of five or six years. The only way out of their trouble thus far discovered by the wine-growers is the planting of American varieties. This has been tried by the owners of some of the great vineyards with unfailling success. The American plants defy the phylloxera and are growing luxuriantly; but it will, of course, take some years to get wine from them up to the old standard, and consequently the small growers hope and struggle on with the old vine. The opportunity which this state of things offers for American wine-growers to find a market in Europe and keep it, does not need to be pointed out. They ought to be able to compete at least with most of the coarse Italian, Hungarian, and Spanish wines already, and beat them before long. The difficulty of a complete substitution of the American vine for the native one, even if it were sure to produce as good wine, may be inferred from the fact that it is calculated that it would take 19,335,780 cuttings to replace the existing vines, at four dollars the hundred. At the rate at which the substitution has thus far been affected it will not be completed in less than 128 years.

The Pope has been having a very troublous time with Belgium ever since the present Liberal Ministry came into power. The controversy having ended in the withdrawal of the Belgian Legation from Rome, and the publication of a diplomatic correspondence which seemed to show that the Vatican held one language to the Ministry and another to the bishops, or was at all events capable of some such construction at the hands of the ungodly, the Pope has now published a long memorandum justifying himself; but it is not much of a justification after all, and does not remove the suspicion that he tried hard to keep on good terms both with the bishops and the Government, or else changed his mind frequently in the course of the controversy. His vacillation has now become almost a scandal in the eyes of the extreme Clericals at Rome, who miss much the old uncompromising tenacity and outspokenness of Pius IX. Leo's permission to the faithful to take part in the Italian elections continues to work well. The Clericals seem to carry the municipal elections without much difficulty.

General Roberts's march from Ghazni to Kelat-i-Ghilzai, a distance of about one hundred and forty miles, was achieved in eight days. It ended on August 23. It was entirely unopposed, the troops had plenty of provisions, only a few men died or were missing, and the horses were kept in good condition. The army rested on the 24th, and resumed its march on the following day, General Roberts expecting to reach Kandahar on the 29th. The sick were left in Kelat-i-Ghilzai, which was handed over to Amir Abdurrahman's officers, the British garrison joining the relieving army. A plan for combined action against Ayub Khan was sent to General Phayre, who advanced from Chaman-Choki to Gatai, and was to reach Takht-i-Pul, thirty-five miles south by east of Kandahar, almost simultaneously with Roberts's arrival before the latter city. Takht-i-Pul Pass, however, has in the meanwhile been occupied by a force of the enemy, and, according to the latest telegrams, Phayre's communications are threatened by tribal gatherings, a feverish excitement pervading the country in his rear, down to the Indus. The siege of Kandahar, however, is considered as already raised, Ayub Khan having withdrawn to the Argand-ab. Concerning Ayub's forces and intentions the reports are conflicting, and the question gravely presents itself, What next, if he retires toward Herat? Will the English Government embark now on a venturesome enterprise against that remote city, or leave Burrows's defeat unrevenge, with Kandahar exposed to fresh attacks, and all southern Afghanistan agitated? Lord Hartington, a few days ago, declared in the House of Commons that the decision in regard to the frontier-line "would not be influenced by the mere fact of certain territory having been acquired by the treaty of Gandamak," which "may be regarded as having ceased to exist"; but this declaration contains no clue to the Government's contemplated policy in general, and, least of all, in regard to Kandahar, which is not within the frontier-line of India created by that treaty.

SUPPOSED SPEECH OF A REPUBLICAN EMISSARY AT THE SOUTH.

ONLY two months remain before the November election, and we have yet to see any result of the Fifth-Avenue Conference so far as relates to stumping the South. To all appearances the Republican managers have preferred the advice to strengthen first the weak points at the North with a view to carrying the October elections; and the probability is that if their hopes are realized they will deem it superfluous to undertake a Southern canvass, while, if the October States go Democratic, they will plead the necessity of making a forlorn attempt to redeem these very States in the final struggle. It may, therefore, not be amiss to imagine what a Republican orator of tact and principle might say to an audience of Democratic whites in any considerable city South of Mason and Dixon's line. We assume that his mission would best be fulfilled by openly courting such an audience in place of one composed either of white or black Republicans.

"I stand before you," he would begin by saying, "already a suspected and odious person because wearing the name Republican. Yet I must frankly avow that my object in addressing you is to defend and, if I can, to establish the proposition that your interest lies with the success of the party to which I belong, and not of the party in which you see almost your last hope of salvation. It is clear, therefore, that one or other of us is laboring under an illusion which ought to be dispelled, and which I shall do my best to dispel if you will give me a patient hearing.

"I shall ask you, in the first place, what you will be most unwilling to grant, to draw a line between the Republican party of to-day and the Republican party of five, ten, or twenty years ago. I do this simply because I am ready, on my part, to do the same by the Democratic party in any comparison between the two. It will, too, save us the necessity of raking up issues which, having been settled, had better now be buried out of sight. I must add, however, that I do not shirk an historic retrospect, and that it is a part of my present purpose to maintain that the Republican party, which accepted and carried on the war to your final defeat and the utter extinction of slavery on American soil, was before, during, and after hostilities the real friend and benefactor of the South. I affirm with entire confidence that no one among you whom you would now choose as a natural leader would advocate the re-enslavement of the blacks, even if he thought it could be done; or would pretend that slavery was not a curse, which you have not paid too dearly to be rid of in the only way in which (as was fated) it could be got rid of; or would deny that the South has never been so prosperous as it is to-day, with such bright prospects of material development, and not one-half its resources exposed, or one-half its territory peopled as it might and will be. This condition has been reached in fifteen years under the rule of the Republican party—under the rule, if you please, of leaders tainted with corruption, and certainly in a period four-fifths of which was to be called one neither of war nor of peace. I shall not stop to justify the methods of Reconstruction, still less the abuses to which it gave rise at the North and at the South; but I may challenge the world's statesmanship to point to any social, political, and industrial revolution of anything like the magnitude of ours having been accomplished in so short a time, and, on the whole, with so little friction, bitterness, and hardship.

"To say this is to compliment you in spite of yourselves, for there can be no doubt that if you had promptly accepted the inevitable—the negro as a citizen, with a vote—the friction, bitterness, and hardship would have been vastly diminished; there would have been no room for a foreign element of demagogism and plunder to which an ignorant suffrage is everywhere exposed, and which supported itself among you so long by virtue of a Federal alliance now past for ever, and repudiated by the Republican party itself. But I hear you insisting that this is not so—that the party would to-morrow reinstate the 'carpet-baggers' if it got the opportunity. Herein is one of the illusions of which I spoke. I might point to the deliberate rejection of General Grant at Cincinnati as a proof of the party's change of mind with reference to military government, but I would rather recall the close of his second administration, when it was manifest that he himself was persuaded that he had been undertaking the impossible, and that the course actually adopted by his successor was the only one left. If two terms of President

Grant could not win over the party to the constitutional views which you successfully resisted (with ill omen for that party's continuance in power), can you ascribe no influence to four years of Mr. Hayes's administration, against which, on the score of purely Federal relations, you have no cause of complaint? Do you not know, and ought you not to feel, that South Carolina is as free from arbitrary and illegal Federal interference as Massachusetts, and must remain so whoever may occupy the White House? Believe me, of all the phantoms which now haunt either section, this—that reconstruction is not closed—is the thinnest and emptiest. The date of its expiration is known—in April, 1877; there is no prophet bold enough to predict its revival.

"You are, then, even if the Republican party succeeds, absolutely secure against any attempt to set up your governments on a foundation of which the Federal Army and Navy constitute an essential part. But two things you must not reckon upon: that the Republican North will ever be indifferent to State governments maintained only by intimidation and fraud, or will ever cease by lawful means to guard the ballot in the hands of the black voter. I will go further, and assert that you yourselves cannot always, without uneasiness, overcome black majorities as you now do and feel perfectly justified in doing, and that you will end not only by tolerating the colored voter, but by seeking in every way to enlighten and elevate him. As a means of what you deem self-preservation you may wink at ballot-stuffing, but you know as well as anybody what is implied in a community of ballot-stuffers. You had your slave-traders and slave-catchers, in the old times, but you did not look upon them as your first citizens, or invite them to your tables and introduce them to your families; nor can you now regard with respect the men whose business it is to keep voters away from the polls, or to count out an honestly polled majority. You tolerate them as necessary tools, and you voluntarily share in the odium which they incur among all right-thinking men who believe that a republican form of government with doctored ballot-boxes is a farce. But you can see the demoralizing effect of this upon yourselves, and can foresee the time when local dissensions will give occasion for putting these fraudulent devices in practice against one or other of two factions of the same party. What security, let me ask, has Governor Colquitt or ex-Senator Norwood at this moment in Georgia that his vote will come out of the ballot-box exactly as it went in?

"It may well be that you are but copying the example of the 'carpet-baggers' in their last struggles for supremacy, but of one thing be assured, that the Republican party at the North has never sanctioned a resort to such modes of perpetuating its lease of power. I do not say it has not committed frauds, or met fraud with fraud; but I contend that the mass of the voters who call themselves Republican are and always have been ready to accept the results of a fair count, and have erected the only safeguards against cheating at the polls and in making up the returns. On the other hand, the Democratic party has persistently, as it got the chance, torn away these safeguards; so that, believing your encouragement in ways which you yourself must deplore, however necessary they may appear, to be disastrous for you, I again hold up the Republican party as the better friend of the South. The time is coming when it will seem none the less so because of its insisting that, within its own province, the United States shall maintain the purity of elections. The Supreme Court has sanctioned this doctrine, and however it may be questioned by constitutional lawyers, or whatever opportunities there may be for abuse in the application of it, no one can profess opposition to the end sought to be attained by it on grounds that will, morally speaking, bear examination. I myself am free to say that I regard this remnant of the Reconstruction measures as wholly in the line of what used to be called 'manifest destiny'—the gradual but steady enlargement of the Federal powers in keeping with the real growth of the country in unity of feeling and interest.

"Here I seem to confess the Republican party a party of centralization, and if I should defend it upon that ground I might have been much worse engaged. But in spite of the wrangles over the use of United States troops at the polls, over United States jurors, supervisors, and deputy-marshals; the records of the last two Congresses show that both parties and both sections sought to use the power of the Federal Government whenever it suited their purposes. Looking only at measures introduced or supported by eminent Southern men, I might cite

Senator Morgan's constitutional amendment recognizing, by implication, the old Whig doctrine of internal improvements; or his Electoral Count Bill, which forbids a State to certify its own Presidential electors, and gives the right to both Houses of Congress—as to which Mr. Garfield said, as a member of the Electoral Commission: 'The preservation of the rights of the States under the Constitution to appoint electors and to declare who has been appointed, is, in my judgment, a matter of much greater importance than the accession of any one man to the Presidency.' I might refer to the refusal of Congress in June, 1878, to authorize the State of New Hampshire to choose a Senator by its existing Legislature; to Mr. Reagan's Inter-State Commerce Bill, to the bill establishing a Board of Health with power to step in and fulfil the functions neglected by State officials, or the bill permitting the Geological Survey to extend its operations into States having local surveys, or the Voorhees resolution to investigate the colored exodus—all supported and carried by Southern votes, and all within the past two years. I conclude, therefore, that honors are easy, and that your fears of centralization are groundless, or have as much relation to the Democratic as to the Republican party.

"There remains the subject of the Federal offices at the South, in which it is probably true there are many unworthy incumbents, but few corrupt or oppressive, unless you have been singularly derelict in making known your grievances. The general administration of President Hayes has been incontestably free from extravagance or peculation; if the Southern branch of it has been an exception to the general purity, the Republican North has yet to hear of it. The election of General Hancock would certainly throw these offices into your hands, and this would probably seem to you an unmixed good. As my business is to deal in paradoxes, I shall venture to assert that the contrary is true; because, unless human nature is different on both sides of the line, the new appointments will be as truly political as those which they replace. Now, it matters little whether the immediate result is an improved corps of officers; they will be no sooner installed than their honors and emoluments will become the envy of others, and their tenure dependent on influences which have no relation to the efficiency or integrity of the public service. Moreover, the revolution which raises them to place will infallibly breed at the North corruption and jobbery in the public offices, and the damage which will thence ensue to the whole country you cannot hope to escape, even if you flatter yourselves that you would avoid corruption among yourselves. You will have purchased a momentary gratification by an alliance with a party which has never given the least sign (outside of its platitudes) that it saw any evil in our present civil-service system, or that it repented of its peculiar doctrine that to the victors belong the spoils. I admit that the Republican party has not done its duty by this great question, but it has done something in practice to administer by business-like methods, and it contains the only body of intelligent and united workers who are bent on securing reform—through a third party if need be. Remembering that your sufferings from rascality during Reconstruction were not owing to the wilfulness of the Republican party—by which always I mean the rank and file, and not necessarily the leaders—but grew out of the very system of political appointments which I am deprecating, it seems to me that experience should make you eager to throw in your fortunes with that party which alone gives any promise of suppressing the most gigantic and dangerous abuse now threatening our institutions—an abuse both anti-republican and anti-democratic, and the abolition of which will redound to the lasting benefit of every section."

Much more our orator might say if his audience remained tolerant, or the editorial column had no limit. Much more he would have to say if he invited debate.

THE OUTLOOK FOR PEASANT PROPRIETORSHIP IN IRELAND.

THE Irish question continues to harass the Gladstone Ministry probably more than any other with which it has to deal, and in a way of which Lord Beaconsfield and his followers knew nothing. The latter always treated Irish grievances as a dreadful bore, and kept a young "swell" in the office of Irish Secretary to chaff the Irish mem-

bers and repeat the club conversations about the peasantry. The Disturbance Bill which the Lords have just defeated was confessedly a hasty measure, and was hard to defend on any other ground than that it was a sign of the good intentions of the Ministry. It imposed a serious disability on landlords by depriving them of their legal right to take possession of their land for non-payment of rent; in other words, it belonged to the class of laws which interfere with the obligation of contracts. These laws are, indeed, sometimes excusable and even laudable, but only on condition that they make no distinctions, but are applicable to all persons of a certain class. The Irish Compensation Bill was, however, only applicable to landlords in certain districts, where the distress of the tenantry was supposed to be greatest. But in these districts the landlords were also worse off than any other landlords, yet no provision was made for the diminution of *their* burdens; they had to meet the charges on their estates whether the rent came in or not. It is not surprising that, under these circumstances, Lord Cairns was able to produce in the debate in the House of Lords a mass of very destructive testimony, showing the injurious effect of the bill on the credit of landlords and on the value of landed property in Ireland. In fact, the bill was not stoutly defended in any quarter. The commercial English Liberals were afraid of it; the philosophical Liberals could say little for it, except that it was absolutely necessary to do something to prevent civil war in Ireland, which Mr. Gladstone said was "measurably" near; and the Irish Home-Rulers and Land-Leaguers treated it as simply a sign that the Government was frightened, and could be made to do a good deal more than they had hoped; so that, beyond establishing the fact that the Liberals would like to do something to regulate the Irish land question, while the Tories would not think of doing anything, the bill has had little importance.

As soon as it was defeated, the Government had to provide for the contingency of the landlords in the distressed districts using their legal right to evict and being resisted—or, in other words, to determine whether it would enforce the law at any cost, even in cases of which it had, by the introduction of the Compensation Bill, acknowledged the injustice. It has, of course, been compelled to announce that it will enforce it, and for this purpose has reinforced the Constabulary, which is essentially a military force, by a regiment of marines. The preservation of peace and quiet now depends much on whether the landlords will or will not assert their legal rights. That they are not men who are easily cowed their history shows clearly enough; but there could not be a more unfortunate time for a display of their courage as against their tenants. They can undoubtedly secure possession of their land, but the land is of little use to them without the prospect of letting it peaceably and getting a fair rent from it, and this prospect is diminished in some degree by every assertion of the extreme land-owning rights. As Judge Longfield pointed out in an article of which we gave a summary last week, the landlord's position in Ireland is precarious, and grows more so. Mr. Parnell is laboring for a general refusal to pay rents, and if this could ever be brought about it would be as fatal to the renting of land in large masses as it was in this State. A general refusal to pay rent, if firmly adhered to, no government in our day could overcome. Cromwell would have overcome it very summarily; but Cromwell's processes are not available for any government in our day, except that of Turkey. A whole people could not be evicted from their holdings, and, even if they could be it would do the landlords no good, because they could not farm the whole island. Of course there is little likelihood that any anti-rent combination can be organized that will cover all Ireland; but the anti-tithe agitation, which rose and triumphed in days when the Irish had much less experience of agitation and much less help and encouragement from outside than they have now, does make a combination large enough to defy the law and make land an almost worthless kind of property over large areas, seem not at all impossible, if the popular exasperation should be kept alive by an undue assertion of legal rights by the landlords.

There are several circumstances which favor such a movement at present, and which have not previously existed. In the first place, the English Liberals are committed, as they have never been committed before, to the doctrine that property in land is not property like any other property—that is, that it is and ought to be subject to restrictions

and modifications at the hands of the legislator to which personal property is not, and ought not to be, subjected. This doctrine, in fact, the Liberals are now endeavoring to apply to English land-tenures. Moreover, the English system of land-letting, which prevailed everywhere over Europe when Englishmen first introduced it into Ireland, has disappeared from every European country except England and Ireland. In no other is the hold of the bulk of the population on the land so slight. Within a century the greater part of the land in France has passed into the hands of the tillers. In Germany and Russia the land has undergone a similar process. In Switzerland great landlords have been unknown since the Middle Ages. In Italy, if peasant proprietors be not numerous, the interest of the farmer in the soil is comparatively large. It is, in fact, only in Ireland that tenancy-at-will exists in naked literalness. Everywhere else the will of the landlord is restrained by usage, or by sympathy, or some sort of acknowledged community of interest with the tenant.

The effect of all this in discrediting the existing Irish land-tenure, and making some great change in it seem easy, is apparent enough. But in addition to this the peasantry are now in possession of the ballot, which has not only destroyed the political power of the landlords, but greatly diminished the political influence of the priests. There has never been a political agitation in Ireland in which both priests and landlords counted for so little as the one now raging, and Judge Longfield calls attention to this as a very serious aggravation of the pending crisis. The plunder of the landowners is for the first time distinctly offered to the peasantry as an attainable political object, and the agitation derives a great stimulus from the fact that every tenant knows exactly what his share of the booty would be in case the enterprise succeeded. In fact, Parnell offers nearly every man who supports him a determinate quantity of land as the reward of victory, which is a very different thing from the general scramble for the possessions of the rich which is all the communistic chiefs have to promise their followers. Of course success is out of the question. Nothing but the defeat of the Government in a bloody war will ever compel the landlords to absolute surrender of their property. But many things might happen to bring about the transfer of the fee-simple of the soil to the tenantry, encumbered with the amount paid to the landlord for it, either directly by the tenant or by the Government in the shape of a loan to the tenantry.

Would the condition of the tenants be improved rapidly by this? Some approach to an answer to this question has recently been made by an examination of the condition of those farmers who formerly held under the Irish Church and bought the fee of their farms when the Church was disestablished. It appears from this examination that no man whose holding is less than twenty acres gains much by the change in anything but deliverance from what all consider tyranny and vexation in the shape of landlord interference. He is rarely able to live and support a family on less than twenty acres without help from some other quarter, such as keeping a shop, or following a trade, or going to England to work at harvest-time. In short, such a farm seems at best but a help. It seems also to be ascertained that hardship or failure has followed in nearly every case in which the tenant had to borrow the whole of the purchase-money—the rule of the money-lender being generally harder to bear than that of the landlord, as more rigid and less indulgent. The cases of success are those of thrifty men who had holdings above twenty acres, and were able to pay one instalment of the purchase-money out of previous savings. There does not, therefore, seem to be much promise in any change of proprietorship for the very small farmers without a great change in their habits. The untiring, unending industry of the French peasant might enable the Irish peasant to make up for the disadvantages of soil and climate from which he now suffers. If he became a careful, indefatigable, penurious cultivator under the régime of peasant proprietorship, the change would undoubtedly be little greater than that through which the French peasant has passed. We shall probably never see any general agreement of opinion on this point in advance of actual experiment. But the accounts of those who investigated the condition of the holders of the Church property go to show that proprietorship in fee does have an extraordinary effect in soothing and tranquillizing the Irish farmer, and turning his attention away from furious politics. They all, no matter how hard their present lot or hopeless their outlook, agreed that being “rid of the landlords” was

sufficient compensation for every present hardship or anxiety. Should this fact become more patent it will furnish a strong temptation to some English ministry, though doubtless a more radical one than Mr. Gladstone's, to make a bid for the devotion of the Irish voters through some process which, even if it does not change the proprietorship of the fee, will destroy the landlord's power over the tenant's manner of life and his management of his farm.

PHILOSOPHY AT CONCORD.—II.

CONCORD, August 14, 1880.

THE evolution and interadjustment of thought natural to the progress of a five-weeks' session have in the end marked for the Concord Summer School a definable issue and attitude, which should be added as a sort of personal equation to the general character of the school sketched in a previous letter. Theism, which was at first implied, has become thoroughly explicit; there is no question now that the title, were it more accurately written, should mention “monotheistic philosophy,” or still more accurately, perhaps, “philosophical monotheism,” for such an inversion of phrase would mark a true distinction, and probably the one most vital for a critical estimate of the school. This faith in theism is not held, in Concord, under any of the contingencies of investigation, as an issue that may or may not arrive; on the contrary, it is taken to be both the datum and the foregone conclusion of all investigating, somewhat in the way materialism takes matter; its possession is regarded as the essential evidence of mental and moral sanity; and, in general, there is the same basic confidence in the method and inspiration peculiarly theistic that philosophy has in the method and inspiration peculiarly philosophic. The appreciative mind readily divines why theists speak oracularly, making mention rather than explanation; their appeal is to the intuition in fellow-men, and the profundity of emotion that enwraps insight. Logic appears a pedant in this company, and the matching of words a descent; thus, in the social sense, it was a mistake one day early in the course of the School when, to the remark “Fate is but a word,” some one replied “Freedom also is but a word.” A better comment, and one at the same time sympathetically cogent, would have been, that all names are but words, and highly secondary to what they signify; for the finest office of theistic and kindred belief appears to lie in drawing attention from the mere labelling and classifying of existence peculiar to the analytical mind toward the inner, unwritten verities.

In the matter of ultimate truth even oracular speech has been discouraged. Emerson says: “Of this essence called Spirit he that thinks the most will say the least”—a sentiment impossible of attainment for a faculty committed to instruction; but that its spirit has been largely observed will be evident. It has been said in various lectures: They who think they comprehend the Infinite do not know what it is. Look at it before you, and it is behind your back. . . . All defining confines. . . . God is nowhere unless he is everywhere. . . . Through Nature up to God? Has any one got through? Is God more up than down? Has any ascension left Nature and her wardrobe behind? . . . The “attributes” of God measure not his greatness but our littleness. . . . The abstract is accessible only through the concrete. . . . The real is the surface upon which the potential writes itself. . . . “God-like” and “beastlike” are not superhuman or subhuman terms; they denote the confines of human character. . . . It is not necessary to attach a definite idea of being to our conception of God. . . . Personality is not a product; it is an essence. . . . We say “thou” to the rest of the universe; that is not religious—all is one. . . . He who will look steadfastly out into the world will suddenly perceive himself surveyed by a great eye returning his stare. . . . “The eye whereby I see God is the eye whereby God sees me.” . . . The true ritual is the active work of charity.

While the theistic and mystical intuitions arrive at these encouraging generalities by a stroke, it is at a sacrifice of the logical perspective which philosophy in calmness retains. The School owes the cohesion and continuity of its programme to the Hegelian element or view, cheerfully insisted upon at all points by Mr. Harris and Mr. Snider. If the universe were made of glass the mystical mind would write “vitreousness” and be at an end, but Hegelianism has a treatise upon dioptries. Hegel has sometimes been taken to be pan-theistic, but the presentation in Concord, as has been implied, is entirely in the light of, it almost might be said for the purposes of, theism. The position is, that self-determination of the absolute, the Hegelian first-principle, constitutes a divine personality—that is, God; for self-determining, absolute mind and ultimate personality are the same thing.

By discovering that a thorough-going psychology involves ontology, Hegel relieved this latter from the distress into which it had been thrown by Fichte's psychological criticism. The simplest sense-perception, Hegel found, cannot take place without the activities of memory, representation, and inference; so that the past, the future (there being prevision), and reason—in fact, the total round of existence—are already involved in the particular object. It would,

therefore, be impossible to find a disconnected lump of existence; the universe is all of one fabric, an inwoven web, or like a dictionary of cross-references where each part exists, with any significance, only in connection with the whole. Here is a concrete unity, the ultimate oneness is discovered in things, not over or beyond them; and by this change from an abstract to a concrete first-principle Hegel rid ontology of what before had been its apparent goal but really its greatest stumbling-block—the empty and impotent abstraction, pure Being. Existence, he discovered, must have its support or vivifying principle from within, not as an addendum; the universal key was in the wards and not to be removed. The conception was a masterful ascent, reaching perhaps the highest northern latitude yet attained in the great philosophical search for a pole. Whether Hegel really stood there, at latitude ninety, and whether, had he done so, he would have arrived at a position any more intrinsically geographical than one at the whirling equator, are questions for the critique of speculative philosophy; it is only to be noticed here, in relation to the Concord School, that any departure towards theism from this principle of universal, progressive oneness, to which Hegel undoubtedly did attain, immediately shows an anthropomorphic tinge; and the further advances to a personal deity and a personal immortality seem to move by an argument clearly contrived for the result. In fact, the misfortune of all very profound systems of thought is the flexibility essential to profundity, but which will permit warping at almost any extent. Hegelianism, on the strength of its dangerously facile dialectic, has been known to pass beyond theism, to Christianity, to trinitarianism, to items of orthodoxy. In many ways science has similarly suffered misuse; the occurrence of parthenogenesis in the insect world, for instance, has been cited to explain the virgin maternity of Mary, and so one may expect to hear some Monday morning in Boston, possibly, the whole of Hegel's 'Encyklopädie' incorporated with the Nicene Creed. While in Concord nothing like this extremity is in prospect, there are absent the indications of what is at present the surest safeguard against the doctrinal degeneration mentioned by Mr. Stanley Hall, in *Mind* of last year, as the chief characteristic of philosophy in the United States. This safeguard is a mental bias, or counter-bias, prompted by what might be called a Wordsworthian revulsion in the world of knowledge—a demand for intellectual sanity, simplicity, and faithfulness at any expense. For the type of mind thus characterized, and it is a growing type, the appealing fact is the contrast between the fatal certainty of the near event, flowing continuously, and always modifiable, beneath man's hand, and the distant inconclusiveness of speculative investigation, so variously illustrated by the whole history of philosophy. There is a conviction that philosophy is seeking far off the opportunity which in truth lies at hand, in the ebb and flood of every-day life; and as for optimistic, pessimistic, and all views at large, they seem less relevant to the situation than some working faith such as might find its watchword in the "meliorism" of George Eliot. The programme of this faith is to better, in the light of discoverable law, the situation to which, whatever the occasion or the outcome, human life is committed.

With the formal philosophical substance of the School that has been thus far dwelt upon there has been an intermingling of disconnected lectures, readings, and conversations for the service of relief and variety—an agreeable miscellany, not to be mentioned in detail, but notable in one or two issues. The readings from Thoreau's unpublished manuscripts by his literary executor, Mr. Blake, have, with the accounts of intimate personal acquaintances, thrown new light, or certainly very unfamiliar light, upon the character of this unique author. It appears that the current notion of Thoreau is about as distorted as could be possible. He was the kindest of men, with an acute sense for the rights of others, and in all social relations was guided by a fine instinct of courtesy. This often would compel acquiescence in opinion or action that jarred with his convictions; and, being a man who above all things lived by conviction, he was driven to avoid whatever might thus compromise himself with himself. No one could more highly and choicely value human intercourse, but a certain moral exclusiveness narrowed him to a limited circle of friendship. He often refused to see people because he could not honestly talk to them. Without vanity, he had a large pride and an equal obstinacy; but the pride, it is told, was of the kind which always marks strict moral fidelity to self, and the obstinacy simply expressed intelligent conviction tenaciously held. Perhaps, on the whole, Thoreau lacked flexibility. There was in his mental, as in his physical, build something angular, and this came prominently forth on occasion. For he had more than the courage of his opinion, as is commonly said of strong-willed men; his opinion was himself. And though there is little question as to a certain inflexibility in Thoreau's character, this in the end will more likely be ascribed to an external situation forcing him to the defensive attitude, than to native endowment or misendowment. Nevertheless, it is at present commonly thought that his was a case of village egotism, that he made virtuous living a "fad," and carried adherence to principle from a wise and flexible regard over into a knotty conceit. The most notable evidence in this direction is his refusal to pay taxes during the Mexican War, which he believed a national sin—a course that on one occasion resulted in imprisonment.

After release from this he wrote the lecture, "Resistance to Civil Government," which is printed in the 'Esthetic Papers' of Miss Elizabeth Peabody. This lecture, written when Thoreau was thirty years of age, should be a sufficient answer to all doubt of his intellectual equipoise. The problem is surveyed from all sides in a manner most cool, impersonal, and logical. It is a document fit to go before a high court in session, and the reader, who begins by being shocked, for the first paragraphs appear to deny all rights and offices of government, is led by line and line of serenely vigorous statement to a conclusion that seems the inevitable outcome of penetrating judgment. He writes: "If the injustice is part of the necessary friction of the machine of government, let it go, let it go; perchance it will wear smooth—certainly the machine will wear out. If the injustice has a spring, or a pulley, or a rope, or a crank, exclusively for itself, then perhaps you may consider whether the remedy will not be worse than the evil; but if it is of such a nature that it requires you to be the agent of injustice to another, then, I say, break the law. Let your life be a counter-friction to stop the machine."

There was just one thing Thoreau would not do, and to understand this is probably to understand his life: he would not compromise individual virtue. The notion of anything short of the finest integrity gave life a bad odor, and he would not have it; his sensitiveness was as great here as with most men in the matter of honor and cowardice, and the fine edge of his character did not blunt under the wear of circumstance, as most commonly happens in the world. The story of the journals, as read here in Concord, with the story of his life told by those who long knew him all point very clearly to one solution of Thoreau's attitude toward organized society: it was neither iconoclastic nor whimsical, but simply expressed private incommensurability with the average taste in ethics and character. When in prison he wrote: "I saw that if there was a wall of stone between me and my townsmen, there was a still more difficult one to climb or break through before they could get to be as free as I was."

The current misconception of the poet-naturalist may be largely founded in the overstatement and paradox frequent in his pages; the overstatement probably made a relief for a solitary and almost abnormally vigorous habit of thinking, and the love of paradox is said to have been inherited from his mother, a woman of unusual character. As to the Walden episode, it was never seriously intended for a social experiment or a social demonstration, though Thoreau sometimes chose so to use the event in his pages, but was simply a move to secure for a time an unagitated and inexpensive life. He was meditating his first book, and perhaps was a little disturbed at home, it is said, by the domestic buzz; probably reasons for economy existed, for he never would receive a gift or a loan of money, and would always even pay his mother for board with her. The year at Walden really did illustrate the possibility of plain living and high thinking; it was a protest, intended or unintended, not against society, but against many needless expenses and evils that society is accustomed to impose upon itself. Mr. Blake remarked in a preface to his readings, that it was from an insatiable, persistent thirst for true society that Thoreau avoided the false, and many of the selections from the journals favored this view, which had become prominent in the conversations before the School. Take, for example, the following: "If I do not keep step with my companions, it is because I hear a different drummer. . . . It is not easy to make our life respectable by any course of activity. We must withdraw into the shell of thought. . . . If my curve is large why bend it to a smaller circle? . . . I will not be shipwrecked on a vain reality. . . . It is not that we love to be alone, but that we love to soar. Will you go to glory with me? . . . My thoughts are my best company. They have a certain independence and individuality. It is rare that we use our thinking faculty as resolutely as an Irishman uses his spade." This is the familiar aphoristic style of the Concord "Deacon of Nature," different from the ordinary crackle of aphorism as the springy branch from a bundle of dried twigs. There were read, also, many passages in the delicately lyrical touch genuine to Thoreau's hand, or others that hinted the fine resonant quality of his emotional side, as where he listens to the sonorous buzz of a telegraph wire strummed by the wind, and then, after riding this thought round the world, tells how the piano-playing of his sister always gave him an unrestful happiness.

The lecture by Mr. Emerson, given late in the course, is no less inviting to quotation than the readings from Thoreau. It was a brief essay entitled "Permanent Traits of Aristocracy," apparently written in continuation of the chapters, familiar to all, on "Manners" and "Social Aims"; but to speak of it here at length will be impossible as well as needless, since the text, it may be presumed, will soon appear. The lectures of Prof. Peabody and Dr. Mulford, coming towards the close of the session, have helped in their way to identify the purpose of the School, and sever the essential from the non-essential in the general current of remark, which has not implied anything more definite than a genuine horror of all that is materialistic or in the fashion of materialism. In a word, liberal theism has found its most liberal hearing in Concord; the details that might make friction are serenely neglected, and there is a general intention towards the "lovelier verities." It is only insisted,

but to this extent rigorously, that the substance or grain of the universe is mind, and that this universal mind is personal. The insight that announces these highest beliefs cannot be formulated—happily, many will think, who conceive the real force of religious faith. Faith and reason appear fundamentally severed in their offices; and it should be said, in conclusion, that the presentations of religion and philosophy here this summer have failed of being excellent just where either has attempted the labor proper alone to the other.

THE ELECTIONS FOR THE COUNCILS-GENERAL.

PARIS, August 11, 1880.

THE 1st and 8th of August were important dates for the French republic, showing what a deep root the Republic has taken in French soil. The renewable fraction of our councils-general was then re-elected. These elections take place every three years, so that in nine years the entire council-general has been re-elected. The councils-general are the deliberative assemblies of our departments, principally charged with the management of their financial, commercial, and agricultural interests. In these assemblies purely political discussion is prohibited; but as everything concerning public instruction comes within their province, they are compelled to devote their attention to the most important political questions of the day. It must not be forgotten, either, that their members are the principal electors of the Senate, which is itself renewed by thirds every three years. The importance of the councils-general has been much increased by the law passed in August, 1871, called the "Law of Decentralization," which is nearly the only truly liberal law voted by the National Assembly. This law has taken away from the prefect (the representative of the central power) and transferred to the council-general the privileges which permitted him to distribute Government favors to the communes, and by means of which he influenced the elections. This political simony has now become impossible.

For all these reasons the elections for the councils-general have acquired great importance. They have, besides, the very special character of forming a preponderating side in country voting; the numerical preponderance of the towns disappears, now that voting takes place by cantons and not any longer by electoral districts of equal population, as in the elections for deputies. Each canton is composed of a certain number of communes, and it names only one general councillor, whether these communes are small or large. The millions of inhabitants of large towns weigh no more in the balance than the thousands of country communes. Accordingly the small country towns find in the council-general elections the surest means of manifesting their opinions. Now, you know the rural districts are much less easily excited than towns, where the working population predominate, who are so impulsive and so easily roused. They might be compared to the surface of the ocean, which the slightest breath of wind stirs up. The population of our rural districts rather resembles the depths of the sea, stirred only by great currents. Peasants, particularly in Catholic countries where the national religion does not tend to develop an initiative spirit, remain somewhat the *pagan* of the fifth century. This synonymy of the words pagan (*païen*) and peasant (*paysan*) is justified by the fact that while Christianity triumphed in all large centres of civilization, the country people, from a spirit of routine, remained still faithful to their old idols. We have also had our political paganism. The Second Empire had been long disowned and opposed in all large and small towns when it still found in the country many strong battalions for its plébiscites. There was kept up a sort of Napoleonic religion which vowed a true worship to the memory of the great and awful chief of the Bonaparte dynasty. There are few cottages where one may not find an image of this terrible warrior, the most formidable mower of men that the world has ever known.

Our popular song-writer, Béranger, was not mistaken when he said in one of his most famous refrains that Bonaparte would long be talked about under the thatch. By loading the country districts with material benefits the Second Empire omitted nothing to preserve their sympathy. The Second Empire is still remembered even after the frightful disasters which its criminal folly brought upon France. On a certain occasion I heard quoted this humorous saying of a countryman who was answering the criticisms which were being made on Napoleon III.: "He was, perhaps, a bad politician, but he was very skilful and clever for the sale of calves." He paid tribute to the Empire for the ease with which he found a ready sale for his cattle during the materially prosperous years of his reign. It must be admitted that the first years of the Republic, when we were obliged to pay an indemnity of four milliards to Germany, were less favorable to the sale of calves and all other agricultural produce than the beginning of the Second Empire; and the peasants readily forgot that they owed to Napoleon alone the terrible taxes which overwhelmed them. Therefore, they are the chief hope of the Bonapartist and monarchist adversaries of the Republic. Their hopes will be disappointed in the most striking manner. The French country districts have pronounced themselves for the Republic with admirable unanimity. A great number of leaders of the monarchist coalition have not even dared to face

the ballot and have disappeared from the struggle. At the 1st of August voting, 900 Republicans were elected and only 382 Conservatives; the Republicans gained 243 seats. There was balloting in 133 cantons. The 8th of August, 99 Republicans were elected, and they gained 55 seats, which almost brings the Republican gain to 300. They have thus reconquered 12 departments, which, joined to the 55 they possessed already, assure them the majority in 67 departments out of 90, without counting that in the others they press hard upon their opponents. These results have considerable importance for the recruiting of the Senate, but they are especially significant as the most irrefragable proof of the consolidation of our present institutions. In vain do our adversaries seek to weaken the import of such a result by pretending that the French country districts always vote for the existing Government. After the kind of *coup d'état* Marshal MacMahon attempted on the 16th of May, 1877, this opinion can no longer be held. For many months the power belonged to the coalition of the monarchist parties. The Duc de Broglie ministry made use of every means of proceeding by official candidature; he employed intimidation against his enemies and lavished favors on his adherents. Marshal MacMahon himself recommended his candidates. Never was stronger pressure put upon any electoral body, and nevertheless the country returned the 363 deputies who composed the Republican majority of the dissolved Chamber, and the Marshal, unwilling to submit to his defeat, was obliged to resign, according to the famous dilemma of M. Gambetta. The peasantry crowded after President Grévy during his official visit to Cherbourg, and although he is the simplest of citizens, without military prestige, a president worthy to sit in the White House at Washington for his freedom from arrogance, he is as much applauded (even in Normandy, which seemed the citadel of anti-republican reaction) as MacMahon was but little cheered when he went on a similar journey during the régime of the 16th of May.

Not only were the monarchists beaten in these last elections, but the extreme radicals also. Their candidates failed almost everywhere. By multiplying their papers they have produced a disastrous competition. The *Intransigeant* of M. Rochefort, of which 80,000 copies were issued the first day, has now a daily edition of only 12,000. The other day a rather comical adventure happened to this gentleman, on the occasion of the last arrival of pardoned convicts at the *Gare de l'Ouest*. Remembering the triumphal manner in which he himself was received, he asked the station-master to show him a side door, so that he might escape the ovation which, doubtless, the population of the faubourg were preparing for him. Besides the relatives of the amnestied, no one came, and M. Rochefort was able to go in by the common entry to wish them welcome, thus estimating the decline of his unwholesome popularity. E.

GERMANY AND THE POPE.—II.

BERLIN, July, 1880.

I SHOWED in my first letter why and how Bismarck's attempts at peace with Rome have failed. It is not the first time that Prussia has been defeated in her struggle with Rome. The relations of the Prussian Government with the Roman Curia are of comparatively recent origin, dating back only to the treaties of Vienna; nevertheless they form so rich a series of diplomatic negotiations and disappointments, unsuccessful attacks and ill-timed surrenders, sudden changes from indolence and suspicion to energy and self-reliance, that there is hardly a more instructive subject for political students than the history of these days. They teach the great precept how *not* to do it. As the complications between king and pope are far from being settled, but on the contrary still form a very prominent chapter of modern history, they deserve to be traced in their retrograde and forward movements.

During the greater part of the last century Prussia had only several hundred thousand Catholic subjects in Silesia, Western Prussia, and part of the Lower Rhine. They lived in peace with their Protestant neighbors, the more so as the Prussian laws on all religious matters have been and are tolerant and mild. The favorite saying of Frederic the Great, that in his State every man could save his soul in his own way, was not an empty word, but a reality. The King, however, knew how to punish the clerical arrogance of Protestant parsons as well as of Catholic priests, and how to make his laws obeyed. He laughed at the Pope who, instead of addressing him as king, always insisted upon calling him Margrave of Brandenburg; nor did this childish caprice prevent Frederic from dealing justly with his Catholic subjects. During the last century in general a more liberal current in respect to all ecclesiastical matters prevailed in cabinets and amongst the people. The Jesuits were even driven out of Roman Catholic countries. Enlightened Catholic princes like Joseph II. extended the rights of the Protestants, while at the same time science and the philosophical spirit of the age combined to undermine the authority of Rome. In the summer of 1786, at their meeting at Ems, the German electors and archbishops discussed the question of making themselves independent of the Pope and formed the plan of a National German Church. Their aims were chiefly frustrated by the intrigues of the German bishops, who

found it more advantageous for themselves to be dependent on far-off Rome than on their own very near metropolitans.

During the wars of the French Revolution the world was troubled by other sufferings and tribulations than clerical arrogance. Napoleon, who had broken the worldly power of the Pope, reinstated him as the spiritual head of the Roman Catholic world, and even agreed with him on a concordat for the sole purpose of using the ecclesiastical chief as a tool with which to fortify his own position and his ascendancy over his subjects. In the spring of 1814 the allied emperors and kings who had dethroned Napoleon, re-enthroned the Pope. To thank them for this favor Pius VII., in his turn, a few months later reinstated the Jesuits, who were welcomed by the ruling reactionary princes as the supporters of the royal thrones and the defenders of religion against revolution. In consequence of the secularizations which followed the peace of Lunéville (1801) the Roman Church in Germany had lost almost all its estates and even charitable institutions, and for its maintenance was dependent upon the good will of the several governments. Frederic William III. of Prussia, by the treaties of Vienna, had obtained from the old clerical territories such large accessions of land that the number of his Roman Catholic subjects increased to about two-fifths of the whole population. Led by the desire of attaching these new subjects to his rule, and of avoiding the remotest suspicion of partiality, he created new archiepiscopal sees and bishoprics, endowed them on the most liberal footing, and hypothecated the income of the higher dignitaries of the church on the public domain. All this was done without any consideration on the part of Rome, and in the expectation that the Pope would help the King in defending and sustaining the so-called conservative interests of throne and altar. The Rhenish Prussians, the King was told by wilful courtiers, were free-thinkers, disciples of Voltaire and French democrats; the best means, he thought, to kill their revolutionary spirit would be to build up a strong orthodox clergy and support it with all the power of the Government. The archbishops and bishops accordingly were allowed free intercourse with the Papal See, enabling the latter to interfere with Prussian ecclesiastical matters. They exclusively controlled the education of the lower clergy, its appointments to curacies and chaplainships, and the superintendence and inspection of the primary schools.

For Prussia there was not the least danger in waiting, but she expected to achieve peace and tranquillity sooner by pressing negotiations with Rome. These the celebrated Niebuhr, who knew very much of the genius of old but very little of the diplomacy of modern Rome, was ordered to conduct. He proved, however, as poor a diplomatist as he was a great historian. Instead of imposing his most essential conditions on the Pope or withdrawing entirely, he negotiated as would become a beaten enemy craving a cessation of hostilities. He yielded all that the Jesuits, then as well as now the rulers of the Roman policy, thought fit at the time to have surrendered. The solemnization of intermarriages between Protestants and Catholics was the principal question on which the parties could not agree. The Prussian law justly determined that, in the absence of previous mutual understanding, the children, if boys, should follow the creed of the father, and, if girls, that of the mother. Rome, however, strictly refused to act in conformity with this law and to permit her priests to perform the marriage ceremonies, unless the future parents bound themselves to have their children indiscriminately baptized as Roman Catholics. Niebuhr was weak enough to leave the matter in suspense, and out of his heedlessness grew all the later difficulties, especially in the Rhenish provinces and Westphalia. The Prussian defeat was complete; the Roman victory was embodied in the papal bull "De salute animarum." As long as Count Spiegel-Desenberg was archbishop of Cologne—the most important metropolitan seat of Prussia—universal peace and good feeling were preserved. Spiegel was a gentleman of refinement and of cultivated mind, of enlightened views and mild, conciliatory manners, in his appearance a grand seigneur, and a dignified and effectual representative of the church. He increased in his diocese the institutes of learning, encouraged a more liberal education of the clergy, limited the celebration of clerical holidays to a smaller number, opposed the too-numerous pilgrimages, and finally, in 1834, perfected an agreement with his bishops which, by meeting the Government views half way on the marriage question and creating a *modus vivendi*, practically removed the difficulty and satisfied the great majority of Protestants and Catholics.

In 1835, however, Count Spiegel died. A stubborn, fanatical priest, a narrow-minded Westphalian baron, Clemens August von Droste-Vischering, of Münster, one of the most bigoted cities of Europe, became his successor. Under the iron rule of Napoleon he had been a pliant tool, and submitted to the French Emperor. Prussia's forbearance, however, he took for weakness and fear, and acted accordingly. Previous to being chosen to his new office Droste had promised to stick to the agreement of 1834 respecting the intermarriage question; but hardly had he been installed than he entirely disregarded it, removed clergymen and teachers who were under the suspicion of favoring Spiegel's reforms, forbade the students to attend the lectures of the liberal professors at Bonn, especially those of Hermes, and when called upon to justify his arbitrary proceedings pretended that he was not responsible to

the Government, and that the Holy Spirit had ordered him to watch over the purity of the Roman Catholic doctrine. It would hardly be possible to account for the appointment of such a man, if it had not been for powers working behind the throne in Berlin, who thought it necessary to appoint this orthodox priest on account of the revolutionary spirit of Belgium. As if religious and political radicalism had not struck an alliance in Belgium and made its revolution! The archbishop's disobedience and open opposition finally ended in his deposition and arrest. In November, 1837, he was confined in the fortress of Minden and kept there till the death of Frederic William III. One of the first acts of the latter's son and successor, Frederic William IV., in 1840, was to pardon and liberate Droste. The same grace was extended to Dunin, archbishop of Posen, who had imitated the example of Droste. The new King, a self-willed and weak, orthodox, and romantic prince, dreamed of a re-establishment of harmonious government by worldly and clerical power alike, which, as in the Middle Ages, would decide the destinies of the world. Full of fancies and whims, he thought it his duty to come to a quick understanding with Rome. In fact, he gave up all that remained of his rights over the Roman Catholic Church. The most fatal measure which he took was the creation, in 1841, of a Catholic department in the ministry of ecclesiastical affairs. This department, backed by a Catholic queen and the ultra-conservative and orthodox party, exercised its influence over all appointments, and, being in constant intercourse with Rome, acted as a spy in a hostile camp. Its proceedings were not as brutal and coarse as Droste's were; it planned its schemes less suspiciously and carried them out more politely. But whatever these Ultramontanes did, they advanced their cause to the great detriment of a liberal development of spiritual affairs. It was, again, the Roman Catholic party which alone, in the revolution of 1848 in Germany, gained real and lasting advantages by extending their independence beyond state control. Instead of meeting with opposition, it received the hearty co-operation of the reactionary Protestant ministers of ecclesiastical affairs, viz., Eichhorn, Raumer, and Mühler, who welcomed it as a valuable ally against the liberal tendencies of the age.

In 1864 the Syllabus reasserted all the mediæval papal assumptions, and claimed the Church's supremacy over all secular power. The doctrine that all Protestants are and must be considered as heretics was renewed by Rome. "Heresy does not at all lessen the discharge of religious duties; the heretic has only one duty more to discharge than a faithful Roman Catholic, viz., to be converted, but not a single one less." In 1870 the Vatican Council perfected the absolute centralization of the papal rule and infallibility. Rome thus reconstructed commenced a clandestine but very bitter war against Prussia, since in 1866 the latter had defeated Austria, one of the most faithful champions of Roman Catholicism. The Pope very well appreciated the consequences of the events of 1866. A state like Prussia, having become by her Protestant character a leading power in Europe, cannot reconcile her existence with hierarchical principles and ideas. Sooner or later she must resume her original task and stand for the autonomy of the individual in religious and political matters. When, therefore, Bismarck's powerful efforts for re-establishing a united Germany proved effectual, it was Rome again which all over Europe collected its forces against the new Empire, and in 1870 it was the same Jesuitical policy, prevailing in the councils of the Pope, which did its best to instigate the French war. After the return of peace in 1871 these same enemies of Germany applied to the Emperor William for the re-establishment of the temporal power of the Pope, viz., by making a campaign against the Kingdom of Italy in the Pope's favor and giving him back the States of the Church. They of course met with a flat refusal, whereupon the Ultramontanes formed a distinct party in the Prussian Diet and the German Reichstag—the Centre. Its sole object consisted in fiercely attacking the policy of the Government, which, of course, was bound to take up the gauntlet.

Its first answer was the Imperial law of July 4, 1872, by which the Jesuits were expelled from the German territory. Then followed the Prussian May Laws (published May 11, 12, 13, 14, 1873) and their appendices, called also the Falk Laws, as Falk, the efficient Minister of Ecclesiastical Affairs, had introduced them. They radically did away with Prussia's vassalage to Rome, initiated by Niebuhr and fortified by Frederic William IV. and the Protestant orthodox clique. The Government at last prescribed the rules for the education and appointment of clergymen; placed the inspection of the primary schools under state control; prohibited the clerical authorities from inflicting punishment for lighter offences against the laws of the Church; excluded from Prussia all orders and congregations of the Roman Catholic Church; prescribed the oath of the archbishops and bishops; stopped the payment of their salaries in case of disobedience; administered the income of these dignitaries after their removal in consequence of open rebellion; and created a special court for the decision of all matters connected with and emanating from these laws.

When, in 1873, the Pope complained to the Emperor of the new laws, William I., on August 7, replied that to his deep concern a part of his Catholic subjects had formed a political party; that Roman Catholic clergy-

men of the highest standing had not only approved of this movement, but broken the laws of the State; that the authority of the laws must be preserved and, if need be, enforced by rigorous means; and, finally, that the religion of Jesus Christ and evangelical truth, to which the Pope had appealed, had nothing to do with these intrigues. In a letter addressed, February 18, 1874, to Lord Russell, thanking him for the sympathies of the English people, the Emperor said:

"I am forced to lead my people in a contest which former German emperors for centuries had to carry on against a power whose rule in all countries of the world has proved irreconcilable with the peace and well-being of nations, and whose victory in our day would endanger the blessings of the Reformation, liberty of conscience, and the authority of the law. Imbued with the spirit of my ancestors, I conduct this war with true tolerance and respect for the religious convictions of others. The laws recently passed do not attack the Roman Catholic Church nor the free religious exercise of its members; they only propose to give some guarantees to the independence of my country and of its legislation. These guarantees existed in a great many other countries, and formerly also in Prussia, without having been deemed by Rome incompatible with the free exercise of religion."

In the same way Bismarck repeatedly laid stress upon the one and undivided sovereignty of the Government to which all, high and low, were subjected. "Whoever claims," said he, "that he need not be governed by the laws of the country places himself beyond the pale of the law, tramples on the law, and will be dealt with accordingly." Every German patriot hailed these words and the accompanying deeds with satisfaction and delight; the nation never stood more unanimously by its Government. An old power of a thousand years' standing, like papal Rome, of course does not succumb to the first attack; an edifice which required centuries for building cannot be destroyed in a few years; a long struggle was therefore anticipated. Bismarck was correct in stating, what was also the opinion of the great majority of the people, that the Government had no need of precipitating the contest. Now, however, after eight years' hostilities, this same Government lays down its arms, thereby sanctioning the inference that by the introduction of the May Laws it had done wrong. For this reason public opinion takes the Government's policy as an acknowledgment of having violated the rights of its Roman Catholic subjects, and regards it as a signal defeat. How this change of tactics was brought about is, as you will have seen in my first article, at present only partly explained; how and when the contest will be reopened again I cannot tell; but you may be sure of one thing: that this struggle for life or death must be renewed by Germany if she would live in peace, and that she must beat Rome if she would not be stricken from the roll of independent nations and great powers of the world. There is not room enough for a German Emperor and a sovereign Pope at Rome. One or the other must yield. In Germany's ultimate triumph you, as well as every other civilized country, are deeply concerned.

??

PROGRESS OF ARCHÆOLOGY IN GREECE.

ATHENS, July 1, 1880.

THE progress made in bringing to light what is left of old Athens is, to any one accustomed to western ways, surprisingly small. The reasons are many, if not entirely satisfactory. Firstly, no one in the East must be expected to hurry—no one ever does; secondly, the foreign governments which have done so much for archaeology in Greece seem to have carried elsewhere their energies; and, thirdly, the narrowness of the feeling of the Greeks themselves checks outside enthusiasm. The Greek is, I judge, of all civilized men the most chauvinist: he willingly allows no foreigner to acquire profit or glory on Hellenic soil. The country is too poor to do much for archaeology, but they say it may be rich one of these days, and then Greece *farà da se*, which is sufficient reason for refusing all concessions to outside archaeology except on terms which few localities justify, and few archaeological authorities or associations are willing to accept—viz., the entire concession of the results of labor and expenditure to the Greek museums. It may suit the German archaeologists to excavate Olympia, where problems of the first importance in the archaeology of art were to be solved with tolerable certainty, or an enthusiast like Dr. Schliemann, to connect his name by unrecompensed expenditure with some classic locality; but already the Germans have given up and closed their works at Olympia, and men of the Schliemann stamp are hardly likely to enter into labors which only result in determinations of unobtrusive archaeological problems.

The influence of the body of Greek archaeologists, backed by a shallow form of patriotic pride, is, therefore, on the whole exerted against the interests of Greek archaeology, because everything is done which can be done to discourage foreign associations from entering the field. Archaeologists, as individuals, have rarely money to spend, and the men whose funds sustain their work, whether the representatives of government or private capitalists, are not disposed to give their money for the solution of dry problems, however much their patriotic pride might consent to do for their national museums, etc.,

etc. The Archaeological Society of Athens lies, like the dog in the manger, the greatest of the obstacles to the advancement of the interests it represents. Everybody who wants to excavate in Greece must sign a copy of the German Olympian convention, which the Germans themselves will accept no longer. Any attempt to show the impolicy of such obstruction or the illiberality of such a policy is met with the reply: We shall be rich enough one day to do all that is to be done, and our treasures had better lie another thousand years under ground than leave Greece. As if the Elgin marbles in London, and the statues carried away by the Romans, but known wherever found as Greek, had not done more for Greece, made more Philhellenes, than all modern Greece will ever do! As if every noble fragment of Greek work sent to the antipodes was not a missionary for the propaganda of Philhellenism!

Meantime, not only are treasures perishing every day, but every advance in the prosperity of Greece is making archaeological research more costly or impossible. The city of Athens of to-day is extending continually over ground which should be sacred to archaeology, at least until it has been searched, and the most expensive part of the modern city overlies one of the most interesting cemeteries of the old city. It is only the chance of having to reconstruct a house which can permit certain points of Athenian topography to be elucidated. And that which was merely the work of ignorance in Otho and his time is being consciously repeated wherever a city is being built on an old site: the old work is being irretrievably covered by the new. Science is cosmopolitan, and what it finds is common good; but there is something revolting to the natural man in this scientific chauvinism, something which checks sympathy with Greece, so far as sympathy results from the admiration of a great past, guarded by such narrow-minded trustees. There are monuments of which no liberal man would wish to deprive Greece; but the sweeping, absurd, and suicidal policy which forbids all excavation except for the Greek museums, and any exportation of objects of antiquity whatever, according to the present laws, checks sympathy, deters aid where it would otherwise be given, and is the cause of injury and even destruction to objects maybe of inestimable value, to say nothing of the continual smuggling which is the inevitable result of all prohibitory laws. The world must be content to congratulate itself that the Romans had carried away most of the valuable statues of Greece, and that England had an opportunity to acquire the Elgin marbles and France the *trouvaille* of Melos, otherwise no one would ever have been able to study Greek art, and probably very little of it would have survived to our day.

No doubt many archaeological associations would be glad to assist that of Athens in what ought to be its special and urgent work, the clearing away of all the rubbish accumulated around the Acropolis and such parts of the city as are still unbuilt over; but I sincerely hope that none will do so till that Society, under whose counsel and direction is all the legislation on the subject, adopts a wider and more liberal policy. What the Society has done since I first saw Athens fourteen years ago ought to have been done in three months. Since my last visit, eleven years ago, it has cleared away the rubbish which concealed the ground visited by Pausanias in part of his third day's visit, disclosing to a more or less doubtful identification the tomb of Talos; the sanctuary of Asklepios with its fountain—as to which no doubt can exist, as the fountain still flows, and you are offered its slightly medicinal water to-day from the old channels; the temples of Themis and Aphrodite-Pandemos; the tumulus of Hippolyte, of which nothing seems recognizable; and the sanctuary of Ceres and the Earth, whose location has been so variously conjectured. Several temples are uncovered in these recent researches, and the fragments have very great architectural interest as showing what wide liberty and variety of detail Greek genius allowed itself. The sanctuary of Asklepios reminds one (pardon the vulgarity) of a modern spa with its colonnade for the promenade of the water-takers. But what are of very great interest, even more, artistically, than anything exhumed of late years about the Acropolis, are some of the votive bas-reliefs which had been placed in the sanctuary, and which are of the most admirable art, while at the same time others prove that even in those times there were sculptors as bad as any the backwoods have produced.

The general effect of the Acropolis rock, as it is uncovered by this nearly complete clearing away of the long slopes of rubbish which once disfigured it (and are still intact on the north side) is grandiose, and one appreciates the matchless position of this citadel, which to all the appliances of ancient days was impregnable if properly guarded and provisioned. The picturesqueness is immensely increased by the discovery of the bold and rugged base of the rock springing out of the plain almost without a preface. There is still a good deal of clearing away to be done on the north side, and possibly some interesting remains to be disclosed, and some perhaps still more important on the west and northwest, where the débris forms a sort of *col* between the Acropolis hill and the Areopagus. It is here, if anywhere, that we must hope to find the solution of the problem of the first fortification of the Acropolis by the Pelasgi, and the indications of the Enneapylæ, the nine-gated approach to the early city of Minerva. To any one who has made a careful study of Pelasgic remains the so-called Pelasgic wall on the Acropolis, behind the

southern wing of the Propylaea, has nothing of this character generally attributed to it, nor is there on the Acropolis itself a piece of wall which merits this distinction. The substantial destruction of every structure by the Persians, and the subsequent employment of all the debris and material which did not serve as substructure (as with the foundations of the first Parthenon) as matter for reconstructing fortifications, etc., leave scarcely a possibility of any part of the early walls being still *in situ* on the Acropolis. But the Pelasgic engineering was in no case that I know of content with a simple circuit of wall defending a crest of rock which in this case hardly needed a wall, and certainly only needed it on the west (the Persian, be it remembered, only succeeded in entering by a subterranean passage, artificial or artificially enlarged, and which the Greeks neglected to guard), and I should be surprised if on uncovering the original surface to the west some indication were not found that the Areopagus had originally been enclosed, as indeed Ovid distinctly says that it was, and that the whole elevated land east of the valley between the Museum hill and the Areopagus was enclosed in the first Athens. The fortifications of that epoch invariably included an upper and a lower city, where the ground permitted it, and sites were very rarely chosen which did not admit it, an isolated peak being often arbitrarily divided when no natural division occurred; and in the case of Athens the complicated defence which we have a right to conclude existed, from the necessity of nine gates to it, could only have been made on the western side of this mass, of which the Areopagus and the Acropolis are only two separate peaks, perfectly conforming by their mutual relation to the conditions required by Pelasgic structure.

The excavation on this side will involve the reconstruction of the road to the Acropolis, probably by a viaduct, if people must go up by a carriage-road, which the ancients evidently did not, as Pausanias particularizes the road by which he entered the lower city of his time (a very different thing from the lower Pelasgic city) as one which was available for carriages; and in his time, moreover, the Enneapylæ had probably utterly disappeared, as he mentions no fortifications whatever. There is, therefore, even with the occasional help of the French and German academies, use for all the funds of the Greek Archaeological Society for a long time on this point of the first importance, viz., the restoration of the Acropolis to its ancient condition. So that one would say that the Society would be disposed rather to attract explorers and stimulate excavation all over Greece than to suppress it by its absurd policy.

A glimpse of the statues just discovered at Melos, though still in their packing-boxes, shows them to be really valuable acquisitions to our knowledge of Greek art, though far from the elevation of the "Venus." They are a Neptune and a female figure draped—possibly a Ceres, but the head and extremities still lacking leave room for conjecture. The new museum is filling up; and though there is little hope that it will ever contain many of the masterpieces of Greek art, unless Italy should be more liberal than Greece and permit the re-exportation of them, there will be enough to make it worth a visit to Athens.

The Mycenæ collection is well arranged and of very great and perplexing interest. I am disposed to side with those who give to it a comparatively modern date, and one utterly inconsistent with the Agamemnonian theory. What is beyond all question is that there are works of widely different epochs, and amongst the engraved stones are two nearly three-fourths of an inch in diameter, of lentoid shape, which are most certainly, if there is any certainty attainable in such questions, of workmanship not anterior to the Roman epoch, and distinctly in the manner of cutting of which we know no example in archaic art, known as such. One of them, a common amethyst—a stone I have never known of archaic use—is not only cut in the Roman manner, with the wheel, but is in unmistakable imitation of an archaic design. This was found in one of the tombs; the other, not less characteristic in technique, but original and late in the spirit of its design, was found outside the tomb; but in both cases not only the cutting but the form and design indicate work done after the best period of gem-cutting. With them were, however, some admirable archaic gems, unquestionable and closely resembling the earliest Etruscan work (if that can be distinguished from Pelasgic). In support of the extreme antiquity of the find, the destructive oxidation of the silver vases is brought forward, but this is more than offset by the fact that the bronze articles are in very good state and far less corroded than the silver, while fragments of wood and cloth remain. A little sulphur in the soil, or lead in the silver, would perhaps account for the condition of the silverware. Taking, however, the gems as the indications, I should be inclined to dispute an antiquity so great as the period of Alexander the Great. There are some gold intagli which I should be inclined to consider as of Asiatic origin, and later than that period by a century or two at least; but, though I am not so confident of this, certain it is that they belong to a decadence of art. The Hisarlik treasures are said to be in the vaults of the Bank, and awaiting the completion of Schliemann's three-story Pompeian villa to be seen by the general public.

It may interest the admirers of the latest discovered form of Greek art, the so-called figurines of Tanagra, to know that they are so extensively and

successfully counterfeited that there are probably not more than three persons in Athens whose judgment is absolutely trustworthy in regard to them. The most experienced amateurs have been deceived by demonstrated forgeries, and the law has already been successfully invoked to reclaim guarantees of the dealers. In one case a figurine sold to a well-known collector for 2,000 francs was discovered to be a copy of an Apollo found at Pompeii; and what is even more glaring, an entirely new type of ornamented terra-cotta has been introduced, fabricated in Crete, and successfully palmed off on collectors as a novelty for considerable sums—in one case I know of as much as £30 for one broken vase, broken intentionally to give it an air of unquestionable genuineness. I was offered in Crete a pair of them in perfect condition for £50, and the owner did not seem in the least surprised when I told him I would not give him ten shillings for them, but put them back laughingly in his basket as if he thought it a good joke between us. In Athens the usual mode of taking in the stranger is to send to the hotel a peasant—an apparently unmistakable rustic—who pretends to have found a couple of figurines in his own field and to be anxious to sell them secretly, as the Government claims the half of all the antiquities found, and to escape this tax he is willing to sell them for a small price. Or perhaps the *valet de place* informs you with great secrecy that a peasant has been about the hotel with some figurines or vases which he wants to get out of the way of official attention, etc. The result is, in general, that in no city I have ever been in are there so many forgeries of antique objects of all kinds as in Athens. It would seem as if something of the old Greek art-feeling had broken out in this vein. Neither coins nor terra-cottas can be bought with any kind of certainty here except by the most capable experts, and for genuine articles the prices are enormously higher than in Italy for the same class of articles, the excavations in Magna Græcia affording much more abundant results than those in Greece proper.

W. J. STILLMAN.

Correspondence.

THE SOUTH CAROLINA CENSUS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In the matter of the census it will be well to consider other figures besides the enumerations of 1870 and 1880. In South Carolina, for example, a State census was taken in 1869, and another in 1875—both, it will be seen, by Republican officials. Now, *e. g.*, Kershaw County presents a stock grievance, as having nearly doubled its population since 1870, from 11,754 to 21,181; but the State census of 1875 gives 20,992. Orangeburg County had in 1860 24,896; 1869, 26,842; 1875, 34,070; 1880, 41,000. Is it not self-evident that the figures of 1870, only 16,865 for the county (the town of Orangeburg only 246!), were grossly incorrect? We had better possess our souls in patience until General Walker gives us the official returns.

MARCEL.

GEORGIA POLITICS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The Democratic Convention at Atlanta, which adjourned without a nomination, was packed, as far as possible, in the interest of Governor Colquitt, and I believe that the election will prove that he was in no sense a proper candidate, and would not have been nominated had the people generally been properly represented at the convention. Whether he is in any way responsible for the disgraceful plundering of the State which was not so long ago exposed, may be a question of opinion, but he is at all events closely allied to the corrupt ring which now controls the Democratic party, and consequently the State, and benefits by its power. I regret to see that the *Nation*, in its review of "The Week," advises the colored people to vote for Colquitt because he did a simple act of justice and his duty to one of their race. The outrage you mention was received with the greatest indignation by all classes in the community, and the comment thereon by the *Atlanta Constitution*—which, by the way, is one of the most bitter partisan journals—well illustrates the general feeling. There are many lawless counties in the State, and one of them was where this outrage occurred. It is, however, a curious fact that for one outrage upon a negro there are twenty on white people—which the relative proportion of each in the population will not account for.

The recent Democratic convention well illustrates which way the wind is blowing, and it is pretty evident that in this State, at least, the party is going to pieces; and this is the general feeling here with men whose opinion is unbiassed. It is unfortunate that the Republican party has no organization in the State, and its early history here is so unpleasant to most of the white population that it never can be revived. The so-called Independent party, which already has great power and is generally supported by the negroes, is led by sharp and unscrupulous men, and is merely a Democratic bolt without any particular organization. It seems to me that this independent movement—of which Senator Norwood is now the leader for governor—should be supported

by the negroes and every one else who desires to see a new party come out of the present chaos, unless it be still more desirable that the negroes should divide like the whites. This latter supposition is not likely to occur, however, while the name of the Republican party exists, and it is to be hoped that a new party under some other name than Independent may take shape from the present discontent, with some creed other than the buried issues of the past.

This is, I believe, a just view of Southern politics to-day by a Northern resident—as far, at least, as this part of the South is concerned. W. T.

MARIETTA, GA., Aug. 23, 1880.

THE BEST WAY TO PREVENT "ELECTION FRAUDS" AT THE SOUTH.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The most certain and effectual way to bring this about is to elect Hancock. The Southern whites fear Republican ascendancy because they think the Republicans would be willing to remand them to negro rule to perpetuate their power. Remove this apprehension by a change of administration, and there could not fail to be a disintegration of parties as they now stand. The whites would then divide, and then the negroes would also divide, and the elections would be more fairly conducted. It was a great mistake to confer the franchise upon the negroes *indiscriminately*. The mass of them are wholly unfit for such a trust. The presence of such a mass of hopeless ignorance as a factor must necessarily degrade our politics, especially as they can never blend with the whites as one people. As long, however, as the color line is forced upon us as the leading political issue, the whites must be expected in some way to be masters of the situation, and any strategy needed to effect this will be considered as justifiable as *similar strategy* between belligerents in time of war.

J. H. T.

EASTOVER, S. C., Aug. 24, 1880.

GENERAL GARFIELD'S CIVIL-SERVICE ATTITUDE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Would you be kind enough to state in your columns what evidence there is, if any, that Mr. Garfield is in sympathy with the Independents on the question of civil-service reform? I ask this because, as an Independent and a citizen of Mr. Garfield's district, I have watched pretty carefully the distribution of offices and the conduct of office-holders in that portion of the district in which I live; and the evidence thus obtained, as well as what I can learn from men prominent in political circles, goes to show that that sentence in his letter of acceptance which you term (No. 785, p. 37) "a vindication of Congressional interference with appointments" is an expression of his real sentiment on that question. In his own district his position is generally understood to be this: Civil officers should be selected, with regard to fitness, from the party in power.

Yours very truly,

L. B. TUCKERMAN.

AUSTINBURG, ASHTABULA CO., O., August 21, 1880.

CIVIL-SERVICE REFORM PUBLICATION SOCIETY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: With your correspondent "J. B. M." (who is certainly a practical man), I will be one of five thousand, one thousand, or one hundred to give, as the case may be, one, five, or fifty dollars a year towards the formation of a publication society, the aim of which shall be the destruction of the spoils system, which in my judgment is not "second only in importance to the abolition of slavery," for it is slavery itself—a degrading bondage which holds black and white alike.

Truly yours,

JOSEPH PARRISH.

PHILADELPHIA, August 25, 1880.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Quite agreeing with your correspondent "F. W. H.," I shall be very glad to assist in the formation of a publication society in opposition to the "spoils" system, and to that end will make the same offer as is made by "J. B. M." in your paper of yesterday.

Yours truly,

CHARLES MCK. LEOSER.

27 PECK SLIP, NEW YORK, August 27, 1880.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I entirely agree with your correspondent, "F. W. H.," in the *Nation*, No. 790, in what he says of the need for "Civil-service reform agitation." I look upon the spoils system as responsible for the bad police, etc., of our cities, for *Seawanhaka* accidents (are not the inspectors appointed on political grounds?), and for *very much* of the bad government with which we are cursed. Holding these views I take pains to express them whenever opportunity offers, hoping thus to do a little towards awaking at-

tention to the need for reform. When the scales once fall from the eyes of our people, short work will be made of the "Machine" and what it stands for. I wish our people could be made to see how directly railroad and steamboat accidents result from the *low official tone* resulting from the bad example and influence of our civil-service performances—that is, *administrative dry-rot*! Some day men will find that these things come home not only to their business but to their bosoms in a very positive sense.

I shall be glad to be a member of the society "F. W. H.," proposes, and to contribute money to its work. I fear it will be difficult to get five thousand (5,000) names—five hundred possibly. I am ready to contribute ten dollars a year, or more, to help to carry on this good work.

Very respectfully,

P. S. J.

BROOKLYN, August 24, 1880.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Ever since it became clear that the noble efforts of Thomas Allen Jenckes, of Rhode Island, in favor of the reform in our civil service were not destined to meet with immediate success, it seemed evident to thoughtful men that the only way out of our Slough of Despond was by the patient methods of the old abolitionists. First and foremost among them was the formation of an association devoted to the reform in question. The well-written communication, therefore, of "F. W. H.," in your last issue, is sure to meet with some cordial responses.

The first desideratum is a preliminary meeting. New York, Philadelphia, and Boston will be likely to be chiefly interested in such a meeting. Of the places named by your correspondent wherein to hold it Newport seems most convenient of access to these three cities, as well as pleasantest at this season.

It would gratify many friends of this reform to feel as confident as your correspondent that after the election many Democrats would join such an association. But with the exception of the Adamses it would be difficult to point to any expression from a Democrat departing from the dictum of Governor Marcy—"the sharp mustard-seed of our present dilemma"—that "to the victors belong the spoils."

W. H.

CHASSETT, MASS., Aug. 23, 1880.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I trust that the suggestions of "F. W. H." in the *Nation* of the 19th inst. will meet with a prompt and effective response in the formation of a society for the publication and diffusion of argument and information in behalf of a true civil-service reform.

The sooner it is done the better. The interest in public affairs growing out of the Presidential canvass would supply a large class of readers among voters at other times indifferent. Nor does it seem unavoidable, or even necessary or desirable, that such a society should enlist under the banner of either Garfield or Hancock. I agree with the *Nation*, and with "F. W. H.," in believing that the friends of such reform have far more to hope from the election of the former. But there are those who sincerely entertain, as they claim, a like hope—I confess I can see no ground for it—through the success of the Democratic party. Why antagonize either, since civil-service reform is a *policy*, which its friends would gladly see enforced by either, and which is promised in the platforms of both? The work of such a society would bind it to no existing party or candidate, as such, and it would affiliate exclusively with either only if and because one should adopt and the other reject it. Its office would be to bring, in the plainest and most practical shape, before men of all parties the vast and increasing evils of the spoils system, the frightful peril into which it has already brought the stability of free representative government, the true nature and methods of the reform desired, its actual simplicity and complete practicability *whenever the people of this country choose to command it*, and the necessity of electing not only a President who will execute, but also Congressmen who will honestly support, or else will be afraid to oppose, efficient laws to that end.

For this purpose, at this time, the dissemination of appropriate political tracts would be greatly facilitated by the existence of thousands of political clubs all over the country, engaged in actively distributing documents relating to public questions, and the fact that many thousands of voters, especially young men, are disposed, as at no other time, to read and think seriously about such questions. The argument for such a reform is independent of either party. Both need to be reformed in that regard, and both have acknowledged the demand for it by promises which each charges that the other means to break—with perfect justice, no doubt, so far as many influential members of both are concerned. Why not so frame such arguments as to reach, without offending, members of either party, leaving the voters whom they convince to decide for themselves which party they can safely trust? Were the tracts of the Anti-Corn-Law League addressed to Whigs or to Tories, or the Anti-Slavery appeals to Whigs or to Democrats, as such? Why need the cause of civil-service reform be handicapped with either Democratic blunders or Republican mistakes?

However, it will be for those who shall form such a society to weigh these

and all other considerations as to the best mode of doing its work. I am satisfied, for one, that the conviction that this reform *must* be had is far more deep and widespread than many of its friends venture to believe: of which it is one indication, that even the politicians and avowed spoilers at Chicago, willing enough to smother, were yet afraid to reject, the Massachusetts amendment to the platform when forced to a direct vote. I am convinced that in capable and fearless hands such a society would meet a welcome and find a pecuniary support greatly beyond the estimates of "F. W. H." The mere fact that it had brought this question home to the voters, and compelled its recognition during the Presidential canvass, would be an important preparation for the determined fight which must and will be made—forced, if need be, by a small band—in Congress, and which, sooner or later, is certain to be won. To those who never lost faith or hope during the war for the Union, and who rejoice in the assured triumph of hard money, common sense, and public honesty over the greenback craze, it is no great stretch of faith to believe that this nation of practical, and for the most part honest and hard-working, business men can be convinced that the same methods which ensure honest, efficient, and economical service in their private business will serve them best also as a people.

I earnestly trust that the proposed conference may be held and such a society formed, and that such men as "F. W. H." names will act with promptness, energy, and, above all, with a hearty faith in their cause.

H. H.

NEWPORT, R. I., Aug. 21, 1880.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I have long wondered why the able advocates of civil-service reform have made so little effort to explain their principles fully to the common people, and expended so much strength in urging politicians to adopt reform resolutions for which they have contempt, and for which they know nine-tenths of the voters have the most indifferent regard.

My association is wholly with the common people, and though my political friends all admit the need of improvement in political morals, I cannot name three who have any definite idea of what is meant by civil-service reform, or how the spoils system is responsible for our demoralization. The recent correspondence in the *Nation* leads me to hope that some plan will soon be adopted to bring this great moral question to the attention of all serious voters. Francis Parkman says that "The champion of the new reform will need no whit less enthusiasm [than the abolitionists], but it must be tempered with judgment and armed with knowledge."

I would gladly give five dollars a year to sustain "F. W. H.'s" "Civil-Service Reform Publication Society," which seems to me to be exactly adapted to spread knowledge and enthusiasm through the country, which Mr. Parkman believes "is full of recuperative force, latent just now, and kept so by the easy and apathetic good-nature which so strangely marks our people." "F. W. H." desires persons interested in the movement which he advocates to send their names and addresses to the Independents' committee-room. Will you please state the full address of the committee?

A. M. G.

WALTHAM, MASS., August 23, 1880.

[Address the Independent Republican Committee, Box 1827, New York.—ED. NATION.]

Notes.

JAMES J. CHAPMAN, Washington, has brought out Mr. Edward McPherson's 'Hand-Book of Politics for 1880.' The contents are of the usual character—President's messages; judicial decisions; Congressional measures, votes, and resolutions; national political conventions, and statistical tables. We doubt if any volume of the series has a more permanent value, if one considers only the light which it sheds on the present controversy over the powers of the Federal Government in the regulation of elections.—Newly discovered material for a volume of sketches by Charles Dickens will be, by special arrangement, printed here in the "Leisure Hour Series" by Henry Holt & Co., under the title of 'Mudfog Papers,' etc. The same firm have in preparation a 'Young Folks' Cyclopædia of Persons and Places,' by John D. Champlin—a welcome supplement to his childish cyclopædia of common things.—J. B. Lippincott & Co. have in press a sociological work which will doubtless be made to do political service also—'Homicide North and South,' by H. V. Redfield. It offers in a scientific spirit "a comparative view of crimes against the person in various parts of the United States."—William Bros., Cleveland, announce a 'History of Hamilton County, Ohio,' by Captain Henry A. Ford.—Macmillan & Co. will shortly have ready Roby's new Latin Grammar for schools, the high quality of which can safely be predicted.—The New England Publishing Co., Boston, Mass.,

will issue this month a bi-monthly international magazine called *Education*, which "proposes to discuss questions of education on the sides of philosophy and humanity," or, less vaguely, to be a sort of pedagogical review in the field of the higher education. Mr. Thomas W. Bicknell will be its conductor.—Mr. B. F. De Costa's "Traditional Washington Vindicated," in the August number of the *Magazine of American History*, is also a rehabilitation of his first biographer, Weems. The story of the little hatchet is ingeniously sustained by reference to the severity of the Virginia laws touching the mutilation of fruit-trees. The number is given up to Washingtoniana, and contains thirty-two hitherto unpublished letters of the general in the years 1782-3. Two of these relate to slaves carried off by the fortunes of war. "Although," writes Washington to Col. Bland, "I have several Servants in like predicament with yours, I have not yet made any attempt for their recovery."—The first annual report of the Cornell University Experiment Station (Ithaca: The University Press) shows what can be achieved without an endowment. It has a special value for dairymen and cultivators; the longest paper relates to the lung plague in cattle.—Last winter (No. 754) we noticed Mr. Fred. Barnard's series of six "Character Sketches from Charles Dickens," published in portfolio by Cassell, Petter & Galpin. The same firm has now reissued them in reduced fac-simile (4to), with little detriment to the drawings, and of course with a marked reduction in the price.—We have received from Macmillan & Co. a 'Treatise on Determinants,' by Robert Forsyth Scott, M.A., of Lincoln's Inn, Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. The principal novelty about the work is the systematic application to the theory of determinants of some of the fundamental principles of Grassmann's 'Ausdehnungslehre.' It is another indication of the irresistible manner in which the ideas of that remarkable man are forcing themselves upon the mathematical world. The work presents the results of a great number of papers widely scattered in mathematical journals, transactions of learned societies, etc. Of these it gives a valuable bibliography. For purposes of self-instruction, it does not appear well adapted to the use of those who have no previous acquaintance with the subject.—The South Australian Institute of Adelaide, whose origin goes back to 1834, exactly a fortnight after the colony was established, laid on the 7th day of last November the corner-stone of its new building, which will embrace a Public Library, National Gallery, and Museum. A pamphlet, giving an account of the proceedings, as well as of the history of the Institute, has just reached us.—Messrs. Sands & McDougall, of Melbourne, Victoria, have published a limited number of copies of 'The Baconian Authorship of the so-called Shakespeare Plays Demonstrated by an Original Enquiry,' by William Thomson, F.R.C.S.—The lectures of Professor Herman Grimm on Goethe, reviewed in No. 639 of the *Nation*, have appeared in a new edition, making a single volume, and greatly improved by the addition of a list of the chief editions of Goethe's works, select references to the literature pertaining to Goethe, a chronological table (1474-1880), and an excellent index (New York: B. Westermann & Co.)—One can now obtain of J. Dumaine, 30 rue Dauphine, Paris, any one or all of the sheets (save that including Lyons) of the map of France published by the General Staff on a scale of 1:80,000, or .792 inch to the mile. They number 258 and upwards (e.g., No. 160, 160 bis, 160 ter). The indication of highways and railroads, canals, villages, heights, marsh, woodland, vineyards, etc., is very minute. The sheets cost one franc each unmounted, and three mounted. The publisher will furnish a *tableau d'assemblage* on application.—Students of the Russo-Turkish war should consult a recent French work (Paris: Dumaine) entitled 'La Guerre d'Orient en 1877-78: étude stratégique et tactique des opérations des armées russe et turque en Europe, en Asie, et sur les côtes de la Mer Noire,' by an anonymous "Tacticien." It has a map, plates, and a sketch (*croquis*).—Our Supreme Court's decision against the constitutionality of the laws relating to trade-marks has prompted a work 'De l'état actuel des relations internationales avec les États-Unis en matière de marques de commerce,' by Édouard Cluny, of the Paris Court of Appeals (Paris: Marchal, Billard & Cie.)

—Among the ingenious explanations of the backwardness of the South in promoting public schools must be reckoned that furnished by the Rev. W. H. Patten, D.D., to a late number of the *Methodist*. "As a rule," he says, "Southern leaders greatly desire the education of the masses of the people, both white and colored, but they fear the consequences of an irreligious education of the masses more than they do the evil resulting from a partial ignorance of letters." Accordingly, "representative men vote money reluctantly to inaugurate and sustain a godless system of education, and not because they are indifferent to the subject." Dr. Patten thinks this view "a slow one," but "safer for all interests." He further explains what he means by "godless education" by saying that it "destroys the power of conscience by destroying the power which is back of conscience, which is God"—certainly the most destructive agency yet discovered. He does not intimate where this system prevails, but his substitute for it is to place "schools for the higher education of the colored people under religious control."

—The position which the late General Albert J. Myer held in the scientific world was peculiar. He was at the head of the most extensive and important meteorological service in the world, which had grown up mainly under his directions and through his instrumentality, and which in ten years has become an indispensable function of the Government. Yet he was not properly to be called a meteorologist, and his official designation as Chief Signal Officer U. S. A. both indicated the original source of his distinction and the kind of talent which he brought to his later work. His invention lay in perfecting the art of signalling, by which during the war he rendered the greatest assistance to the operations in the field. His success since 1870 in organizing and developing the meteorological branch of the Signal Office was owing to very great executive ability on his part, and the wonted liberality of Congress in matters pertaining to science. In criticising his annual reports we have remarked on the disturbance of the records caused by embracing the returns of stations dominated by their environment, on the fatal want of accuracy in editing the returns, and on other evidences of the lack of a controlling mind imbued with the principles of the science. On this side, therefore, General Myer's loss can more than be made good, and it should not be difficult both to maintain the existing discipline and to extend the service with better judgment. Perhaps also his successor will be less open to the suspicion of magnifying his own reputation at the expense of his assistants and subordinates. General Myer was a native of Newburgh, N. Y., where he was born in 1828. He took his degree in medicine at the University of Buffalo, and entered the Army in 1854 as an assistant surgeon.

—The Marquis of Bath has recently published a little book under the title 'Observations on Bulgarian Affairs,' in which he gives the impressions received during a journey through Eastern Rumelia and Bulgaria in May and June, 1879. It is in no sense an account of his travels, but a clear and pleasantly written description of the people and the new governments established by the Treaty of Berlin, their relations to their neighbors, and their prospects for the future. The Marquis does not conceal his strong Liberal bias and his disgust at the success of the Jingo Government of Great Britain in preventing the creation of a powerful Bulgarian state, consisting of Eastern Rumelia, Bulgaria, and a part of Macedonia. The strong Turkish sympathies of the English officials are, however, not without some advantage, as the following extract will show:

"In all probability the English Consul-General has contributed in no small degree to the success of this, the most recent, and, for the present, most prosperous attempt at self-government on the part of a province lately subject to Turkish rule. By his unceasing hostility he has brought home to the Bulgarians the consciousness of there being among them an ever-present enemy ready to turn to account any mistake they may commit, and impressed on them the necessity of sinking all minor differences in order to unite for the preservation of their newly-acquired liberties, and in support of the governor and of the constitution, on the maintenance of which they at present depend."

The author has a high appreciation of the value of the labors of the missionaries of the American Board. "The result of their teachings," he says, "has permeated all Bulgarian society, and is not the least important of the causes that have rendered the people capable of wisely using the freedom so suddenly conferred upon them." The general desire for schools and a superior education is quite remarkable, as is the absence of class or race hatred, even against their former oppressors. The strongest opponents, apparently, of the new state and the province are the Phanariot Greeks, who have seen their ecclesiastical supremacy overthrown and their political hopes of the succession to Constantinople endangered by the rapid development of the Bulgarian nation.

—In the August number of *Le Livre* M. A. J. Pons insists upon the importance in Balzac's career of his failure as a publisher, and afterwards as a printer and type-founder. He gives interesting details of the classics bearing the imprint of H. Balzac, "éditeur-propiétaire, rue des Marais-Saint-Germain 17," which were issued in 1825 and 1826—the complete works of Molière and La Fontaine. These were put forth in illustrated *livraisons* forming a single volume when complete. Balzac furnished a *Life of Fontaine*, in which, as M. Pons says, by a curious kind of misinterpretation the novelist "unconsciously projected his own features upon those of the fabulist." Neither can M. Pons praise the engravings (after designs by Devéria, some of whose work is reproduced in this number of *Le Livre* in connection with another article); but print and paper were excellent and the price not dear. Still, nobody wanted the books, and they were disposed of as waste paper before one in twenty had been sold. With a loan of \$6,000 from his indulgent father, Balzac and one Barbier, a practical printer without funds, set up an office and manufactured a number of books, including, besides some of good quality, 'L'Art de mettre sa cravate' and (most ominous) 'L'Art de ne pas payer ses dettes.' They even added a type-foundry to their establishment when the pinch was hardest, as a means of improving their credit, and then their creditors compelled them to liquidate, leaving the printing-office to

Barbier and the foundry to a M. Deberny, who found his profit in it. Balzac emerged with honor but loaded with debt, and then resumed strenuously his literary undertakings, having gained an experience which was of the greatest value to him. He had seen the bright and the dark side of life, and especially learned all the shifts of the impecunious. His Gobecks and Birotteaus and Crevels were partly the reflection of his own past. Above all, he learned "the potency of money and the grand rôle which this force plays in our modern society."

—European scholars are still busy discussing the revelations made last winter by Prof. Sophus Bugge and Dr. A. Chr. Bang, of Christiania, Norway, in regard to the origin of Teutonic mythology. Illness has prevented Prof. Bugge from publishing his lectures in an authentic form. Of Bang's little work (*Völuspá og de Sibyllinske Orakler*, Christiania, 1879) we have received a copy in the original, and also a German translation by J. C. Pestion (*Völuspá und die Sibyllinischen Orakel*, Vienna, 1880). The translation is somewhat enlarged, giving, instead of references to the Sibylline oracles, the passages themselves in full, so that the reader who has not the opportunity or the time to refer to the work itself, which is very scarce, finds his task at once more agreeable and more profitable. The Norse edition also abounds in aggravating misprints, which have been corrected in the German version. As already pointed out in the *Nation* of March 18, of this year, Prof. Bugge has attempted to show that a considerable part of the Teutonic mythological literature is not national, but is based partly on Jewish-Christian, partly on Greek-Roman legends, and was imported to the north by the vikings from Ireland and the isles around Great Britain. In the work before us Dr. Bang has made a special investigation in regard to the 'Völuspá' (the vala's prophecy, the first and by far the most interesting and important lay in the Elder Edda), and has come to the remarkable conclusion that both as to form and contents it is wholly based on the Sibylline oracles, and that, like these, its purpose is to scatter Christian doctrines among the heathen. From the second to the fourth centuries after Christ there were produced a number of so-called Sibylline oracles, purporting to be of divine origin, and in a credulous age they were not unfrequently quoted by the Church fathers. Of these a collection was published in two volumes by Alexandre (Paris, 1841-53), and another, complete and furnished with critical commentaries, by Dr. J. H. Friedlieb in a metric German translation (Leipzig, 1852). It is to these post-classical Sibylline books that Dr. Bang refers. The whole drift of his discussion is to show that the songs of the Elder Edda, the prose tales in the Younger Edda, and the Latin-dressed stories in Saxo Grammaticus—that is to say, all those weird traditions which we have been taught and have accustomed ourselves to regard as the venerable and unadulterated expression of Teutonic heathendom—are a mere hash made out of Teutonic, classic, and Christian ingredients.

—After a careful perusal of both the original and the translation, and after a painstaking examination of the references, we are bound to say that we utterly fail to see the force of the author's arguments. The numerous passages in the oracles referred to as parallel to lines in the 'Völuspá' are never convincing, and in some instances seem almost ridiculous. The only resemblance we are able to see between the two is that they treat of the origin, development, destruction, and regeneration of the world. But, in the name of common sense, what mythology or religion does not do this? On this principle it would be easy enough to show that the Hindu mythology is founded on the Norse, or to prove that any religious system is borrowed from any other. In the Sibylline oracles we fail to find a single myth, a sentence, a line, or a name like those in the 'Völuspá' and the Eddas. Where in the oracles is there a word about Nifheim, Muspelheim, Ginungagap, the Eli-vogs, and the whole pre-chaotic condition of the universe? There is not a syllable about Ymer and Audhumbla, who represent the Teutonic chaos; nor of Odin's creating the world (Kosmos) out of Ymer's slain body. There are no names in these oracles that, etymologically or otherwise, suggest Odin, Thor, Balder, Loke, Frey, etc. The oracles speak, like the Bible, of the end of the world and the wicked times that go before its destruction; but these passages bear not the slightest resemblance to the Eddaic description of Ragnarok (the twilight of the gods), in which all the good, on the one side, and all the evil forces, on the other, meet on the great battle-plain Vigrid, and mutually slay each other. They are as unlike as the Teutonic representation of creation is unlike the Jewish. Of course there is a place of reward for the good and a place of punishment for the bad; but the Sibylline oracles depict for us no shield-thatched Valhal, no Gimle that outshines the sun, and no Nastrand constructed of serpents wattled together, with all their heads turned into the hall and filling it with streams of poison in which perjurers, murderers, and adulterers have to wade. Indeed, the similarity between the oracles and the 'Völuspá' is so very slight that we cannot see how any one could be struck with it. Furthermore, if the supposed author of the 'Völuspá' imitated the Sibylline oracles, where did he find them? Dr. Bang makes short work of it by alleging that these Eddic lays, which every one knows are written in pure Old-Norse, were composed on the Orkneys, on the

Hebriides, and in Ireland and Scotland, where there were monasteries filled with rare books. We look in vain for any proof of this.

—In the 'Sammlung gemeinverständlicher wissenschaftlicher Vorträge' (Berlin: Carl Habel) three recent numbers—339, 'The Government-Post of the Roman Emperors,' by Prof. Gottfried Ritter von Rittershain, of Prague, and 340 and 341, 'Journals and Journalists of the French Revolution,' by Dr. Ambrosius Neményi, of Buda-Pesth—are noticeably interesting, and give a good idea of their subjects. The Roman post was created by Augustus, and was an imitation of the Persian system. Before the time of the Cæsars the rulers of the provinces were much more independent than afterwards. The cost of the post fell upon the provinces, and was almost wholly without benefit to private individuals. The names *cursus publicus* and *cursus vehicularis* show that light wagons were used when the quantity of despatches was great, or speed not especially important. With regard to the *evectio*, however, the despatch of persons as well as baggage, by imperial permission, the author is of opinion that this arose under later emperors. Permissions to use the post were called *diplomata*, at first a word of wider signification, but, after the second century, used especially for postal permits, and the officers charged with issuing them—mostly freedmen—were called a *diplomatibus*. The system fell into decay with the fall of the empire, but Theodoric the Great attempted to revive it, and in France down to the ninth century, long after the fall of the Merovingians, the old technical terms were still in use, for some of which the reader must look outside the usual classical dictionaries. The author refers to numerous works on the subject, and gives interesting details and quotations.

—The journalists of the French Revolution Dr. Neményi divides into three classes: the earnest, the bloodthirsty, and the satirists. Under the first head we have Mirabeau, Brissot, André Chénier, Loustallot, and on the other hand, as defenders of constitutional ideas, Mallet-Dupan and Ch. J. Panckoucke, founder of the *Moniteur Universel*. Of the second class, Marat, Fréron, and Camille Desmoulins, in some of his phases, and, on the royalist side, the Abbé Royou. Hébert, the founder of the *Père Duchêne*, belongs to this class also, but on account of his literary qualities the author places him in his third class, along with Desmoulins, whom, with Carlyle, he considers the brightest of all and the wittiest. The author describes at length the wit of the journalists on the royalist side, and has special praise for Suleau among the journalists of the reaction. Suleau, he says, was one of the most strangely gifted men and most honorable partisans, and had no superior in the possession and expression of the Middle-Age French wit. With Desmoulins, he is the humorist of the period—a melancholy time for the display of humor, but the two writers are characteristic of their generation. The number of the journals of the Revolution was immense, but no paper thrived except in opposition. On the other hand, every day saw a new list of newspapers whose appearance was forbidden and whose editors were condemned either to exile or death. Michelet says that at one time 600,000 copies of the *Père Duchêne* were printed. It appears to be certain that 80,000 copies of this weekly were printed and circulated.

THE BAYARD OF INDIA.*

"THE Bayard of India"—such was the name which, in the days of their friendship, Sir Charles Napier conferred upon James Outram, and its strict propriety is attested by the fact that it remained associated with him, though Sir Charles Napier had become the bitter enemy of the man he had once commended. To the world in general Sir James Outram is known chiefly, if not entirely, by the romantic generosity which declined to supersede Sir Henry Havelock in command of the troops destined for the relief of Lucknow. Sir James Outram was the senior officer. He had been summoned in hot haste from Persia to assume high command in India. He was a man, as one of his friends said of him, "absolutely consumed by ambition"; but justice had all his life been dearer to him than his ambition, and "therefore" (to quote the language of his own order) "the major-general, in gratitude for and admiration of the brilliant deeds of arms achieved by General Havelock and his gallant troops, cheerfully waived his rank on the occasion, and accompanied the force to Lucknow in his civil capacity, tendering his military services to General Havelock as a volunteer." An extraordinary impression was made at the time by this generous act of self-renunciation; but the full measure of the sacrifice it involved was unknown to the world until the publication of General Goldsmid's 'Biography.' In reference to it he writes as follows:

"Every one can appreciate what it must have been for an ambitious soldier to surrender the glory and satisfaction of conducting to a triumphant issue, under the eyes of the whole world, such an enterprise as the rescue of the imperilled garrison of Lucknow. But this was not all. He believed, on what were at the time good grounds, that the rebellion would virtually collapse after the capture of Delhi and relief of

Lucknow, and that any subsequent operations would be of a desultory character, unlikely to afford any opportunity of distinction to an officer of his rank. In short, he believed that this month's campaign would in all probability bring his military career to a close. He was already a G.C.B., and any additional reward must necessarily assume the form of a permanent title with a pension attached. He therefore believed he was irretrievably surrendering the certainty of a baronetcy and its accompaniment. Further, it was understood that the treasure in the Residency, stated to be from twenty-three to thirty-two lakhs of rupees, would, in accordance with precedent, be adjudged prize-money. He elected to receive the insignificant share of a civilian volunteer, instead of the very substantial one of the general in actual command. Thus he deprived himself 'not only of all honors, but' (we quote an allusion to the subject in a private letter of his own) 'of the only means of support for the declining years of a life the chequered vicissitudes of which have afforded no opportunity of making any provision for the requirements of age.' If in after years the matter was mooted in his hearing, he was wont, as his custom was when his own good deeds were spoken of, to turn it off by some self-depreciatory remark, such as 'People have made too much of it,' . . . and so on. But it is only fair to the memory of an unselfish man now to make public what he only revealed in confidence. The surrender of the command was no mere chivalrous impulse, but a deliberate act of self-sacrifice."

The unique characteristic in the public life of Sir James Outram is the number of such acts which it contains. They begin almost with his entry into the military service of the East India Company. He was still only a young lieutenant when he had become conspicuous by the prudence and circumspection, not less than the dash and enterprise, with which he handled troops in the field. Sir John Keane, the Bombay commander-in-chief, had in consequence nominated him to the chief command of an expedition to suppress some insurgents, over the heads of several superior officers. The reply of the young lieutenant to this signal mark of distinction is highly characteristic:

"He declared himself sensible of the distinction conferred upon him by such a mark of confidence, but felt it his duty to point out that the appointment of so junior an officer might give umbrage in quarters where unanimity was necessary. The senior officer on the spot was almost the senior captain in the army; none above him could be sent with the detached companies of which the force would be composed; whereas he himself, from his junior position in the army, would, if in command, be the cause of separating captains from their companies to the detriment of the service. He wrote, moreover: 'The qualifications of the officer now commanding the detachment in the disturbed districts are far superior to mine. I willingly stake my humble reputation on his conduct. Associated with him, as I presume I shall be in the duty, while he has the honor of success, mine be the blame of defeat, in measures of which I am the proposer.'"

The Commander-in-Chief, however, declined to be balked of the services of the chivalrous young lieutenant, and Outram was obliged to do violence to his feelings and accept the command.

We find him acting in a precisely similar fashion in the Afghanistan war of 1838-42. His services in this campaign had been manifold, and of the most arduous and distinguished character, but more especially towards the close. He had then been entrusted with the charge of holding open General Nott's communications at Kandahar with British territory on the Indus. At that time not only Kelat but all Sindh was independent territory, ruled by native princes, who might, had they pleased, when disaster overtook the British forces in Afghanistan, have barred the way for either supplies or reinforcements, in which case the troops at Kandahar would in all probability have succumbed, as did the troops at Kabul under General Elphinstone. It was due to the political ability and indefatigable exertions of Major Outram that all such disastrous results were averted. But the most signal service he rendered to his country was his opposition to Lord Ellenborough's pusillanimous purpose of withdrawing the British troops from Afghanistan without having effected the liberation of the ladies and gentlemen held prisoners by the Afghan chief, Akbar Khan. Such a policy, it is easy enough to imagine, must have been inexpressibly revolting to such a mind as Outram's; and he did not cease to argue and protest against it until it had been relinquished. But Lord Ellenborough, though compelled to forego his purpose, could not forgive the man who had brought this humiliation upon him. He bided his time, and Outram's generosity soon furnished him with what he desired. A British force under the command of General England was defeated by the Afghans at a place called Hykulzai. The defeat was due to the incapacity of the officer in command; but it is a common thing when accidents of this kind occur to pass over the real criminal and select some unimportant subordinate as the scapegoat. The scapegoat on the present occasion was a young lieutenant, Hammersley—an officer in the political department, and working under the orders of Outram. England's defeat was due, so the Government of India declared, to the deficient information regarding the number and strength of the enemy supplied by Hammersley, and that officer was, in consequence, deprived of his political appointment, and remanded back to his regiment. Outram knew that Hammersley had been wronged. That was sufficient for him, and he determined to vindicate the reputation of his subordinate. He was well aware of what the consequences would be to himself of thus assailing a re-

* James Outram: A Biography. By Major-General Sir F. J. Goldsmid, C.B., K.C.S.I. Two vols. London: Smith, Elder & Co. 1880.

condemned decision of the governor-general; but that in no way deterred him. Hammersley's reputation was vindicated, but the pent-up wrath of Lord Ellenborough descended upon his champion. Outram was remanded back to his regiment. In his despatches on the termination of the Afghan war the governor-general sedulously abstained from either mentioning his name or referring to his services; and so it came about that in the distribution of honors and promotion absolutely nothing was conferred upon Outram—"My real offences," writes Outram to a friend, "being such as he (*i.e.*, Lord Ellenborough) cannot forget—*i.e.*, my advocating poor Hammersley's cause, and opposition to the disgraceful retreat from Afghanistan. . . . But I regret nothing that has passed; indeed, you are well aware that I fully laid my account to suffering personally in the cause of Hammersley months ago; and were it all to do over again I would not vary my course. I am prepared for the worst, and fully expect it."

Precisely similar was Outram's behavior with reference to the Amirs of Sindh. No one doubts now that the conquest of this province and the deposition of its rulers constitute one of the most dishonorable episodes in the history of British rule in India. But at the time Outram stood almost alone in his perception of the injustice and the dishonor. He was under no obligation to protest against the wrong of it. He knew well that he could do neither without raising up around him a swarm of powerful and implacable enemies. But Outram never counted the costs when a wrong had to be rectified and it was in his power to contribute aught towards its rectification. He stood forth alone as the champion of the fallen Amirs of Sindh, simply because they were weak and fallen; and the animosity with which Sir Charles and Sir William Napier pursued him in consequence will remain for ever a blot upon their memory. For Sir Charles, Outram retained through life the warmest affection—an affection which survived unchilled the bitter hostility with which Sir Charles assailed him. General Goldsmid recounts a pleasing anecdote to illustrate this. The incident occurred when Sir James, then at the zenith of his fame, was commanding the intrenched camp at the Alum Bagh, in the neighborhood of Lucknow:

"A comrade, not by any means the least distinguished of his officers, once accompanied him to the rear of the camp, to inspect a detachment of native cavalry that had lately joined. The native officer in command, after paying his respects to Outram (who as usual treated him with the most kindly courtesy), said he would like to produce some letters which he possessed from English officers under whom he had served. His request was readily granted, and, retiring to his small tent, he presently returned with the much-prized testimonials. The first paper put into the general's hands at once aroused his interest. 'I was standing,' says our informant, 'close behind Outram, and heard him speaking to himself, as he read the letter. Thus he soliloquized: "Ah! poor Charley; he could appreciate a good soldier." The manner in which these few words were spoken sufficed to convince the hearer that he who uttered them had the warmest feeling towards the subject of his contemplation. It was, indeed, a worthy tribute *in memoriam*, for the writer of the native officer's certificate was no other than Sir Charles Napier."

The extracts we have given from General Goldsmid's work will suffice to show that the general's style is not one suited for biography. In fact, a more unfortunate selection could hardly have been made than that which entrusted the writing of such a life to so ponderous and unimaginative a writer as General Goldsmid. It was a life fraught with romance and moving accidents by flood and field. Outram, in his young days, was a mightier hunter than Nimrod: and later on he was diligent in hunting the bubble reputation at the cannon's mouth. Wherever he was placed, he kindled in the minds of those around him a perfect enthusiasm for him and his service. He won the hearts of savage races, and reclaimed them from their wild and predatory habits to become peaceful, law-abiding agriculturists. The soldiers he commanded, whether British or native, regarded him with an affection wonderful to recall and to have seen. But General Goldsmid's arid narrative fails completely to make us *feel* all this. We accept it on his testimony; but the subject of his biography is not made to move before us in his habit as he lived. This is greatly to be deplored. A biography of Sir James Outram, worthily written, would have been a book of surpassing interest and fascination.

GREEN'S HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH PEOPLE.—I.*

MR. GREEN'S 'History of the English People' is completed. The time, therefore, has now come for expressing our estimate of an author whose works are certain to exert a wide influence on the study of English history. Mr. Green's merits are great and unmistakable. Not the least of them is that he has brought the task which he set before him to an end. This is an age of great schemes and of small performances. Increased masses of information have, especially in the province of history, daunted the energy of enquirers. The stupendous amount of knowledge which may be gained by assiduous labor makes students feel that to accomplish any great achievement involves an amount of preliminary study which necessitates the devotion of a

life to the preparation of materials whence a literary monument may be erected. Hence one life after another is consumed in preparation. The stones for the building are collected, and the architect dies before he can even lay the foundations of his gigantic edifice. The spirit of criticism, moreover, is essentially adverse to the daring recklessness necessary for creation. We think our age happy in its immense stores of learning; we forget that the weight of fuel may put out the fire, and that a generation imbued with a passion for investigation has lost the capacity for creative production. Hence the present is a period of fragments, and that author is certainly to be called happy who in the nineteenth century sees the completion of his work. Such felicity is not the mere gift of fortune: it is the proper reward of certain rare intellectual merits. It can be attained only by those writers who are endowed with a sense of literary proportion, who can measure their means for reaching their ends, who have the good sense to form designs which lie within the compass of human industry, and who possess the aptitude for doing exactly the task set before them and avoiding the infinite temptations to stray into other fields which do not really lie within the scope of their efforts. These gifts Mr. Green certainly possesses. Every line he writes exhibits talent and what we have termed aptitude. He never pretends to be a profound investigator. The aim of his work is to present to his readers the latest and best results of enquiry in a compendious and readable form. He does not try to add to the fruits which have been attained by the labors, say, of Stubbs, of Freeman, or of Gardiner. What he endeavors to achieve is to combine the results obtained by the investigations of the best enquirers and to make them intelligible to the English public. No man could take upon himself this kind of labor who was not a trained student of history. But the particular function undertaken by Mr. Green is literary rather than historical. His book is the performance of one of the ablest and cleverest literary men of the day. It is because he has kept consistently before his mind the fact of his duty being one rather of exposition than of investigation, that he has succeeded in completing his work. His success, like all true success, is the legitimate fruit of energetic labor directed by talent and insight.

The second distinguishing quality of Mr. Green's workmanship is that it is guided throughout by an original and, in our judgment, a true conception of the principle on which an historical manual meant for general reading should be written. The prevailing notion is that such a compendium should be an abridgment, and should contain a brief account of everything (such, for example, as invasions, battles, laws, etc.) which would be given at length in larger works. The inevitable fault of such an idea is that it leads to the production of books which, like the 'Students' Gibbon' or 'Students' Hume,' are to most persons unreadable, and which, in the attempt to tell something about everything, end in conveying to the reader nothing about anything. Mr. Green, with the insight of genuine literary genius, rejected the attempt to tell something about everything, and wrote his manual on the principle of telling a great deal about a limited number of events and transactions. These events were to be the salient points in the history of England. The omission of a host of details, the careful avoidance of matters which if dealt with at all ought to be dealt with fully—such, for example, as the strategy of generals or the principles on which great campaigns were conducted—gave him space in which to paint the marked features of great crises or the outlines of remarkable characters. Of the skill with which he has described the limited number of matters on which he fixed the attention of students, one cannot speak too highly. The immediate and immense popularity of his short history (in which his genius is exhibited to more advantage than in his later and longer book) was sufficient proof that he had discovered, or rediscovered, the art of compressed historical narrative. One may also add that critics who candidly compare Mr. Green's work with such a meritorious and dreary production as Kitchin's 'History of France,' will agree that the writer of genius has, in the composition of his manuals, perceived and followed a sound principle which escaped the attention of the worthy and industrious Mr. Kitchin. The author of the 'History of France' tells us a great deal and leaves nothing impressed on our minds. The author of the 'History of the English People' omits much which other writers would tell us, but of the little he does tell us he impresses a great deal on our recollection. The moral which Mr. Green's success forces on all writers is that a manual is quite a different thing from an abridgment.

Mr. Green's undoubted merits are balanced by some grave defects. He exhibits a tendency to become what we can only call "sketchy" in his treatment even of important topics. It is quite in accordance with his design that details should often be omitted. Of this, accepting as we do his principle of composition, we do not complain; but a writer who omits details is bound to mark clearly and distinctly the main and important points of his narrative. Mr. Green, especially in his last volume, is by no means careful in the matter of precision. There is something very loose, for example, in his narrative of Monmouth's rebellion. After an account of the rout of the rebels at Sedgemoor, Mr. Green adds that "their leader fled from the field, and after a vain effort to escape from the realm was captured and sent pitilessly to the block." This sentence may in the writer's own mind mean a good deal. The word

* 'History of the English People. By John Richard Green, M.A., Honorary Fellow of Jesus College, Oxford.' Vol. IV. New York: Harper & Bros.

"pitilessly" is probably to him emphatic. But surely Monmouth's end deserved something more elaborate than mere adverbial allusiveness. Can any one believe that an intelligent boy or girl set to read the 'History of the English People' would in the least realize the features of Monmouth's death? It is, we presume, mainly by its fitness for younger students that the merits of Mr. Green's work should be tested; yet this criterion is exactly the test which his last volume, at any rate, hardly stands. What we have termed his sketchiness is not his only defect as a teacher. He has always exhibited boldness approaching to rashness in the enunciation of wide views; he has always been what one may call "viewy." But his real insight, and, in the earlier parts of his history, his thorough command of his subject, have kept his tendency to viewiness within due bounds, and have made his theories, if not always correct, at least always striking. As we advance nearer to present times his speculations become not less bold, and are, we cannot but feel, based on less solid ground. We do not for a moment mean to intimate that Mr. Green's capacity for grasping the essential features of the historical landscape before his eyes ever deserts him. One may learn much from his views as to modern England. Few writers have grasped more firmly the transformation of Great Britain into the British Empire. None have shown more clearly the relation between England and her colonies and the true import of the struggle for American independence. Industrial England, and its relation to the moral and political changes which began towards the close of the century, have, perhaps, never been better drawn than by Mr. Green. He has, indeed, almost omitted all reference to that most important topic—the history of English law—but in this he has only followed an error which must probably be considered inveterate till some man of genius makes the growth of English law his special study. What, however, we complain of is a kind of speculative rashness which certainly goes beyond knowledge.

The view, for instance, of Pitt's statesmanship is certainly original. He is grouped by Mr. Green with statesmen, such as Turgot and Joseph II., "whose characteristics were a love of mankind and a belief that as the happiness of the individual can only be secured by the general happiness of the community to which he belongs, so the welfare of individual nations can only be secured by the general welfare of the world." But the originality of the estimate of Pitt, which makes the favorite minister of George III. a representative of "the larger sympathy of man with man which especially marks the eighteenth century," is far more obvious than its correctness. Students will find it difficult to accept an analysis of Pitt's character which contradicts the impression left on all his contemporaries. Mr. Green's view may be right, but it needs to be supported by undoubted knowledge both of Pitt and of his age. Such support is, we must frankly say, wanting. It were absurd for any ordinary reviewer, and certainly for the present writer, to pretend to anything like the acquaintance with English history possessed by Mr. Green. We do not doubt that his inaccuracies are nearer the truth than that average knowledge of educated men which is, compared with the knowledge of experts, but a decent name for ignorance. Still, it is impossible not to note points which though small in themselves seem to betray that Mr. Green is not quite at home in the eighteenth century. Thus, of Pope he writes: "His life, as Johnson says, was a 'long disease.'" For aught we know, Johnson may make this remark, but Johnson certainly knew, what Mr. Green apparently does not, that this pathetic description of an existence racked by illness was given by Pope himself when he refers to the muse who served "to help me through this long disease—my life." The error is a trifle. It may be a mere slip of the pen. It is far less significant than the statement that Burke "struggled bitterly against all proposals to give freedom to Irish trade." Certainly such was not the impression of the electors of Bristol, and on this matter we venture to think that they were better informed as to the policy of their member than is Mr. Green. We have not the remotest wish to make too much of such slips as these. They may be the only errors in the whole of Mr. Green's four volumes; they may mean nothing but that the author happened to be away from a library when he was correcting his proof-sheets. At the very most they only show that a man of genius may be wanting in accuracy. They do, however, make us receive with some hesitation our author's bolder speculations, and suggest that he is a safer guide for the reign, say, of Alfred or of William the Conqueror than for the period of George II. or of George III.

Moreover, if we may in our turn enter on the dangerous path of speculative criticism we should venture to propound the theory that the very nature of Mr. Green's task makes it likely that he should be less successful in his treatment of modern times than in his dealing with the earlier periods of history. His object, as we have pointed out, is to reproduce in a striking literary form the best results of other men's historical labors. If a writer is to do this with success it is absolutely necessary that he should deal with fields of investigation which have been already well worked. An era like that of the Norman Conquest, all the portions of English history included within Professor Stubbs's four volumes, the Reformation, and, to a certain extent, the religious and political struggles of the seventeenth century, have of recent times been carefully explored, though they can hardly be said to have been

worked out. Each of these periods has, at any rate, been so studied that Mr. Green can find with regard to them that kind of material which he needs. He is never a servile imitator, but he thoroughly knows a good authority when he has one; and when he has guides such as Stubbs or Freeman he can trust their guidance, and, working upon the materials which they have sifted, use freely his own great powers of narration and speculation. With the history of modern England it is otherwise. That any one who has not devoted his existence to the study of the age of George III. should try to master all or the greater part of the documentary authorities for the Georgian era would be simply ridiculous. A writer such as Mr. Green would, no doubt, read what may be called the authoritative historians for that time, if such historians existed. Unfortunately, they do not exist. There is no one who has made himself the master of George III.'s reign in the way in which Mr. Freeman has, so to speak, appropriated the Norman Conquest, or in which Mr. Gardiner is gradually making himself the acknowledged authority for the reigns of James I. and Charles I. The result is that Mr. Green has not at hand the kind of help which his sort of book requires. In finishing his work he has been forced not only to build but to bake his own bricks. He has erected a striking literary monument, but we cannot greatly wonder if the last part of the edifice has suffered from the unfavorable conditions under which the architect has been forced to labor.

RECENT NOVELS.*

MR. BLACKMORE returns to his old manner and merit in 'Mary Anerley,' which is to be ranked with 'Lorna Doone' and 'The Maid of Sker,' and deserves the praise—sometimes of more value than just now—of being called the novel of the year. It is a Yorkshire tale of such proportions and variety that we cannot attempt an epitome of its plot, and must be content with saying that its characters are very numerous, and divided into four or five sets, each of which illustrates a different though convergent action; that it is partly a sea-story, the hero being first a daring smuggler and afterwards a junior lieutenant on the *Victory* at Trafalgar; and, in fine, that it contains the elements of two or three ordinary novels, and elaborates them all with ease. The time is the beginning of the century, and the book is a picture of English life that has a real value as well as a romantic interest, just as was true of 'Lorna Doone,' which illustrated the seventeenth, and 'The Maid of Sker,' which concerned the last part of the eighteenth century. In this sense Mr. Blackmore may be called the successor of Scott. Indeed, in the two earlier works mentioned he has done for the romance of history what Scott failed to do—namely, lent it the reality of local color by an archaic style surpassed, so far as we know, only by the archaism of 'Henry Esmond,' and perhaps not very greatly surpassed even by that. But in temper and attitude Mr. Blackmore is Scott modernized, if that be not a contradiction in terms; that is to say, though he is as romantic to the full, and some of his scenes are as melodramatic as anything in 'Waverley' or 'Rob Roy' or 'Ivanhoe'—witness John Ridd's visit to the Doone valley, which his readers will vividly recall—his tones are so quiet and his observation of the true relations of character and incidents to human nature and life in general so nice, that there is the same difference between his romance and Scott's as between a modern battle picture and an old-fashioned "historical painting." This is not quite saying that his attitude is wholly modern, which perhaps would imply an absence of the quick sympathy with the subject needful in every just treatment of history; but his sympathy is of the literary order which enables him to appreciate the past from his own view-point and illustrate it with his own art, without making such free translation and adaptation of it as Bulwer, or James, or Harrison Ainsworth, let us say. For he is first of all an artist, and shows an artist's subtlety of divination in treating traits and emotions capable of satisfactory treatment only in this way; experience, observation, even erudition being poor substitutes at the best.

Notwithstanding his distinctly romantic bent, it is with character that he mainly occupies himself, and for the illustration of certain points of character rarely illustrated in humdrum life that he uses his romantic machinery. Such natures as those of Robin Lyth and Lieutenant Carroway are to be found fully developed, perhaps, only amid exciting scenes, and, in their characteristic details, only amid such circumstances as existed on the Yorkshire coast at the beginning of this century. Mary Anerley herself not only could not have been born out of Yorkshire, but could not exist there now, doubtless; and, allowing for the essential identity of human nature in all times and places, it would be difficult to imagine any one of the interesting group by which she is surrounded—Miss Yordas, Mrs. Carnaby, Stephen Anerley and his wife, the Poppletons, Mordacks (one of "the prize men of fiction," as Thackeray would say), and the Flamborough people—figuring in one of Mr. Trollope's novels. It cannot be denied that this is strong evidence of the fact that Mr. Blackmore is not greatly interested in what are known as colorless characters, and perhaps would be no great hand at portraying such; and this, from the

*'Mary Anerley.' By R. D. Blackmore. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1880.

point of view of the modern novel, is undoubtedly to be called a limitation. But, as we have intimated, if he is old-fashioned enough to be most at home in depicting picturesqueness, he is nothing less than old-fashioned in the subtlety with which he does it. No modern dissector, such as George Eliot (if we may hazard the temerity) or Mr. Blackmore's more immediate rival, Mr. Hardy, can set before us the lineaments and deportment of a personage with "points" more vividly and completely; and this used to be thought something to do.

Saying, however, that Mr. Blackmore is first of all an artist ought to be qualified by adding that he is pre-eminently an English artist. He is altogether given over to following the lead of his own sweet will, and it must be confessed it conducts him in a very charming manner through very pleasant places. Having only his own original force, and the tastes of a public that wears responsibility in such matters as fiction very lightly, to depend upon, a novelist who has Mr. Blackmore's force is very fortunate. Very likely he would say he does not care a button about style, for example; in which case he is lucky to have made shift to get such an admirable one, so flexible, so genuine, blending so well those generally incompatible elements, power and charm. He will, if he likes, humor himself in making a wretched pun now and then; in delaying his action by quaint philosophical digressions that could not fail to irritate a hostile reader; in putting a literary aphorism into the mouth of a character that could by no possibility have either conceived or expressed it; in loitering over the details of a landscape which has the charm of familiarity for him, but none for another; in introducing full-length portraits which have no intimate connection with the set he is avowedly painting; and in verbal quips and eccentricities of phraseology which utterly contradict the character of his quaintness, which is that of admirably-studied simplicity rather than whimsicality. In the face of all this, one can only suggest that it is very agreeable to find his merits so far outweighing his blemishes, and possibly to solace one's self with the query—which never occurs to the strictly academic critic—whether, namely, these blemishes and merits are not cognate, and whether, if Mr. Blackmore should have a respect for his art too great to permit him to take such frequent liberties with it, he would not lose something in the vivacity and absolute sincerity that are among its chief claims upon our admiration, and contribute, it may be, to the sense of large truth (as pictures of life) that informs his books—'Mary Anerley' notably.

It would be difficult to imagine a more complete contrast than that afforded by two such writers as Zola and Gaboriau, each of whom probably detests the aims and accomplishment of the other with cordiality. In a certain sense the works of both belong to what George Sand called "the literature of the mysteries of iniquity," but the function of one is to exploit the romantic possibilities of such mysteries, and that of the other to show their vulgar

'Clorinda. By Emile Zola. Translated by John Stirling.' Philadelphia: T. B. Peterson & Brothers. 1880.
'Monsieur Lecoq. By Emile Gaboriau. Boston: Estes & Lauriat. 1880.
'Hepzibah Guinness.' By S. Weir Mitchell, M.D.' Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1880.

A NEW BOOK BY DICKENS.

Just Published.

The Mudfog Papers, etc.

By CHARLES DICKENS, author of 'The Pickwick Papers,' etc.
NOW FIRST COLLECTED.
16mo, Leisure-Hour Series, \$1.

* * * These papers have just been unearthed by Mr. Bentley, and are not included in any edition of Dickens's works.

HENRY HOLT & CO., Publishers,
NEW YORK.

New English Books

At 25 cents to the Shilling.

Sent, post-paid, direct from London, on receipt of price of publication in bankers' draft, currency, or post-office order.

The recent Custom-House and Post-Office Circulars permit all printed matter to be mailed to the United States with safety and economy, and the duty, if any, to be collected from addressees.

Stevens's Priced List of nearly 500 English, French, and German Periodicals, with fuller Announcement for supplying books by mail or freight, is distributed gratuitously by every public library in the United States, by Tice & Lynch, 34½ Pine Street, New York, and B. F. STEVENS, American Library and Literary Agent, 4 Trafalgar Square, Charing Cross, London, England.

DAVID G. FRANCIS, 17 Astor Place, New York, Dealer in Valuable Second-hand Books, has always on Sale 25,000 volumes or more of Ancient and Modern Books in various departments of Literature, for Public and Private Libraries. PRICED and DESCRIPTIVE CATALOGUES of portions of the stock are issued from time to time, and will be forwarded to book-buyers free of postage.

Orders for any obtainable books, American or foreign, promptly filled at the lowest prices.

F. W. CHRISTERN,

Foreign Bookseller and Importer, 37 West Twenty-third Street, New York.

The principal publications of Quantin, Charpentier, Dentu, Didot, Hachette, Calmann Lvy, etc., on hand; also complete sets of Tauchnitz's collection of British authors and Teubner's Greek and Latin Classics. New publications received from Paris and Leipzig as soon as issued.

The Nation.

and inane reality. The latter, at least, is part of Zola's profession, and he has rarely had fewer relapses into the art of the romancer than in 'His Excellency Eugene Rougon,' to which the translator has given the title of 'Clorinda.' The change, by the way, is to be regretted because it tends to obscure the intention of the author by exaggerating one element of his hero's career. M. Zola's political prejudices contribute further obscurity; a spirit of contempt, not to say hatred, dominating his usual passionless philosophy. But the book contains some of his best work; the study of each incident is exhaustive, and at times subtle enough to show a different phase to, and awaken a different judgment in, different minds—an effect justly to be called artistic, and thoroughly antagonistic to his most impressive "naturalism." In other respects it is rather a failure; the transitions are abrupt, there is juxtaposition without continuity, and the author struggles with his mass of material with evident effort and apparently divided purpose. With a slight subordination of the principal character it might have been made a study of the Court of Napoleon III., or a heightening of the conception of Clorinda would have made it a picture of the power of a woman without scruples and with a superstition for a religion. But to give these two motives as prominent a position as they hold obscures the chief one, which is the study of the greed of power exhibited in a man who can accept no defeat of his instincts, and it results in confusing and weakening all three. Historically, one of the most important chapters is the baptism of the Prince Imperial. Of 'Monsieur Lecoq' we only need to say that it is one of the most labyrinthine of detective stories, and that no one who likes these will begin it and leave it unfinished.

'Hepzibah Guinness' gives the title to a volume of three well-told stories. The scenes of the first two are laid in Philadelphia, and they deal with the strictest sect of the Quakers. The devices which these find allowable in their relations with the people of the world, and their jealous watchfulness lest one of their number should slip from the fold, form a good background to two pleasant little love-stories, which are, however, in so low a key that the tragic element of the second seems a little incongruous. The third story, 'A Draft on the Bank of Spain,' is more ordinary.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Authors.—Titles.	Publishers.—Prices.
Albott (E.), Authorship of the Fourth Gospel: External Evidences	(G. H. Ellis) \$0 75
Atkinson (E.), The Railroads of the United States, swd.	(A. Williams & Co.) 2 00
Barnard (F.), Character Sketches from Dickens	(Cassell, Petter & Galpin) 2 00
Bayne (F.), Essays in Biography and Criticism, 2 vols., 3l ed.	(Henry A. Sumner & Co.) 75
Belet (A.), The Strangers of Paris, swd.	(F. B. Peterson & Bros.) 1 25
Black (W.), White Wings	(Harper & Brothers) 60
Capes (W. W.), Livy	(D. Appleton & Co.) 3 25
Clarke (Col. A. R.), Geodesy	(Macmillan & Co.) 60
Contributions to the Archaeology of Missouri, Part I.: Pottery, swd.	(Geo. A. Bates) 20
Edwards (Dr. J.), Greek and Roman Coins in the Yale College Collection	(New Haven) 20
Freed (A. T.), Hancock	(Henry A. Sumner & Co.) 20
Garnier (A.), Scientific Billiards	(D. Appleton & Co.) 20
Gilmore (J. R.), Life of James A. Garfield, swd.	(Harper & Bros.) 20
Gordon (Rev. D. M.), From Victoria to Winnipeg	(Dawson Bros.) 20
Horn (F. W.), Geschichte der Literatur des Skandinavischen Nordens, Parts 5, 6, swd.	(R. Westermann & Co.) 1 00
Institute Essays	(Geo. H. Ellis) 1 00
Janson (K.), Spell-bound Fiddler	(S. C. Griggs & Co.) 1 00
Junkin (Rev. D. X.) and Norton (F. H.), Life of Winfield Scott Hancock	(D. Appleton & Co.) 1 00

T. ELLWOOD ZELL,

No. 1114 Arch Street, Philadelphia.

SCHOOL BOOKS.

Collet's Progressive French School Series.
Progressive French Grammar and Exercises.
Progressive Pronouncing French Reader.
Progressive Interlinear French Reader.
Progressive French Anecdotes and Questions.
Progressive French Dialogues and Phrases.
Key to Collet's French Grammar.
Evidences of Christianity. By Alexander, Watson, Jenyns, Leslie, and Paley.
Hart's Spenser and Faery Queen.
Kay's Infant and Primary School Reader and Definer.
Locke's Essays.
Murray's English Grammar, abridged.
Milton's Paradise Lost, with Explanatory Notes and Life of the Author.
Paley's View of the Evidences of Christianity.

Cheap School Editions of

Pollock's Course of Time, Thomson's Seasons, Young's Night Thoughts.

French and German Books.

All new and popular French and German Works received as soon as issued. Catalogues of old and new French, German, and English Books furnished upon application.

JOHN PENINGTON & SON,

127 South Seventh Street, Philadelphia.

School-Books in the Modern and Ancient Languages.

One of the largest stocks in the country.

Catalogues on application.

CARL SCHOENHOF,

Foreign Bookseller and Importer, 146 Tremont Street, Boston.

Two Valuable Text-Books.

WURTZ'S ELEMENTS OF MODERN CHEMISTRY.

By Adolph Wurtz. Translated and edited, with the approbation of the author, from the fourth French edition, by Wm. H. Greene, M.D., formerly Demonstrator of Chemistry in Jefferson College, Philadelphia. With 132 illustrations. 8vo, extra cloth, \$2 50; sheep, \$3.

"There are a great many text-books on chemistry in the field already, but we know of none that will fill the wants of the student so completely as this. It presents the facts of organic as well as inorganic chemistry without being as voluminous as Fownes, as condensed as Barker, or as unsystematic as Roscoe. The theoretical part is clearly told, the progress of the exposition being illustrated by experiments. The book is excellently printed and fully illustrated."—*New York Medical Record.*

PRANTL'S TEXT-BOOK OF BOTANY.

Botany. An Elementary Text-Book of Botany. Translated from the German of Dr. K. Prantl, Professor of Botany in the Royal Academy of Forestry, Aschaffenburg, Bavaria. The translation revised by S. H. Vines, M.A., D.Sc., F.R.S., Fellow and Lecturer of Christ's College, Cambridge. With 275 illustrations. 8vo, extra cloth, \$2 25.

"The work is thorough and practical, and beautifully illustrated. It should be examined by every American teacher and student of botany."—*Boston National Journal of Education.*
"It is with a safe conscience that we would recommend this book as the best of its kind in the English language."—*London Nature.*

* * * For sale by booksellers generally, or will be sent by mail, post-paid, upon receipt of the price by

J. B. LIPPINCOTT & CO., PUBLISHERS,

715 and 717 Market Street, Philadelphia.

The famous Portable Bookcase of

Lockwood, Brooks & Company, Boston, Mass., is not only portable but is a permanent and handsome piece of furniture for the library and drawing-room. Send for descriptive circular and price-list.

